

Gal m d
A N
E S S A Y *k*

ON THE
Gift of Tongues,

PROVING
THAT IT WAS NOT THE
GIFT of LANGUAGES.

I N
A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

Nos qui sequimur probabilia nec ultra id quod verisimile occurrerit progredi possumus, et refellere sine pertinaciâ et refelli sine iracundiâ parati sumus.

BATH, Printed by R. CRUTTWELL;
AND SOLD BY
J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;
J. BARRATT, BATH; AND J. LLOYD, BRISTOL.

MDCCLXXXVI.



ERRATA

- Page 40, l. 14, for *apostle's* read *apostles*.
47, l. 16, place the semicolon after *speech*.
68, l. 5, insert *to* before *speak*.
68, l. 24, dele *to* after *speak*.
82, l. 25, for *were* read *was*.
112, l. 22, for *bearer's* read *bearers'*.
118, l. 24, for *makes* read *make*.

DEAR FRIEND,

YOU asked me some time ago, I remember, what my ideas were of the GIFT OF TONGUES, and I answered that It was a subject, on which I had not been able to make up my mind. I have since however examined these *strange tongues* once more, and being persuaded that Christians in general have misunderstood their meaning, I take the liberty to transmit to you the result of that examination.

You have hitherto, I know, acquiesced in the common opinion, and believed, as well as you could, that the *gift of tongues*, or rather the gift of speaking in tongues, was the gift of understanding and speaking languages without having learnt them; and the perusal of this Essay may not alter your opinion, but you will read with patience what is intended to be proposed with meekness.

Cyprian, Erasmus, and others, have maintained, that the miracle was wrought, not on the speakers, but on the hearers; and that the *Jewish* language which the apostles

B spoke

spoke on the day of Pentecost became *Greck* to a *Grecian* hearer, and *Latin* to a *Roman*.

Dr. *Lightfoot* says, that to speak in *tongues* was to speak the language in which the *Jewish* scriptures were written; which, he supposes, was different from the vernacular language of the Jews in the times of the apostles, and understood only by the learned.

It is not worth *my* while to waste either time or argument in the refutation of these two notions; which never, I believe, had many advocates, and which are now universally abandoned. I shall only observe, that *Cyprian* and *Lightfoot*, with all their disciples, must have thought the common notion palpably false, when they could prefer unto it such notions as these which had so little appearance of being true.

Mr. *Byrom*, the author of the *Essay on Short Hand*, says, in a note to one of his poems, that speaking in *tongues* means speaking in *tones*, *tunes*, or *musical notes*: but he does not attempt to reconcile this idea with the accounts which we have of that gift in the New Testament; and the only argument, as far as I remember, which he produces

duces to support it, is *that* from the sounds of those musical instruments to which St. Paul compares a person who speaks in *tongues*. I do not know that there are in the world two persons who have adopted this singular opinion: but is it therefore erroneous? It was his fortune first to propose it, it is mine to justify and defend it.

My arguments, however, will be rather of the negative kind. They will not prove decidedly, perhaps, that speaking in *tongues* means speaking in *tones*; but they will prove that it does not mean speaking *languages*; and what else then can it mean besides speaking in some peculiar *tones*? You will give me leave therefore, I hope, to reckon every objection to the common opinion, an argument in favour of Mr. Byrom's.

There are two different words in *Greek*, which the translators have rendered into *English*, by the same word, *tongue*; one of which is *διαλεκτος*, which signifies *language*; and the other *γλωσσα*, which, where it does not signify *tongue* in the literal sense, I imagine, signifies *tone*, or some kind of musical sounds. In this conjecture, however, I may be mistaken; and against the justice of it

may be objected, that phrase which five or six times occurs in the Revelation, *nations*, *kindreds*, *people*, and *tongues*. The original word for *tongues* here is γλωσσα; but even here *tongues* does not necessarily mean languages. And that it cannot mean languages is very probable from several reasons which I might easily produce; though I will not take the trouble to produce them, because I can afford to grant all that the objection demands. For let tongues here mean languages; what is the inference? Only that γλωσσα, like many other words, has three different meanings. It *may* in these texts signify languages; but what I maintain, and all that my hypothesis requires me to maintain, is, that in reference to the *gift of tongues*, it universally signifies *tones*, without one exception to the contrary. With this clue to guide me, let us see what account I can give of the apostles' speaking on the day of Pentecost. They spoke the *Jewish* language, and they spoke in *tones*.

First; They spoke the *Jewish* language. To proceed regularly, and step by step, in this untrodden path, you will excuse the formality which my argument must assume.

Every

Every man (it is said, Acts ii. 6.) heard them speak in his own language, διαλεκτω.

1st; I observe, that the whole multitude which heard them was composed only of *Jews*, and a few profelytes from *Rome*. Now there were dwelling at *Jerusalem* *Jews*, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Acts ii. 4. *Strangers of Rome, Jews, and Profelytes.*

2dly; I observe, that it was not the profelytes, but the *Jews* only, who said, *How hear we every man in our own tongue, (that is, language, διαλεκτω) in which we were born: Acts ii. 8. Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven: and when this was noised abroad the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. Acts ii. 4, 5.*

3dly; I observe, that all these *Jews*, though natives of different nations, understood the same language. How else could they converse together, and say one to another, *Are not all these Galileans? Acts ii. 7. What meaneth this? Acts ii. 12. There was some one language which was common to them all, and in which they expressed mutually their doubt and astonishment.*

4thly; I observe, that this language was the *Jewish* language. When St. *Peter* rose up to put an end to the dissonance and confusion of tongues, and began to explain the meaning of the miracle, we find that all his hearers understood him, and that his discourse converted three thousand of them to Christianity.

It has been asserted indeed, that St. *Peter*, not intending to be understood by the *Jews* from other nations, addressed himself only to the natives of *Jerusalem* and *Judea*. And were all the other *Jews* suffered to depart, in their astonishment and doubt, without having one word said to them about the design of the miracle, or to convert them to the faith of Christ? *They were all amazed, and were in doubt: Acts ii. 12.* And permitted to go away just as wise as they came together! Incredible!

And what reason is there to suppose, that the apostle spoke only to the natives of *Jerusalem* and *Judea*? Because it was they, you say, who charged the apostles with drunkenness. And why they more than the rest? Because they, you say, did not understand them. Not understand them! I thought
that

that on your hypothesis, the fifteen different nations heard them each in its own language. But the *Judean* Jews, you say, could not understand them, when they were speaking in the languages of other nations. This, I reply, was the case with all the multitude. On your own hypothesis, every nation was in the same predicament. Let the apostles speak what language they would, only the people of that language could, in that language, understand them;—they could not be understood but by one nation at a time. It is true, that when they spoke *Latin* or *Greek*, the *Judean* Jews could not understand them. But is it not equally true, that the *Italian* Jews could not understand them when they spoke *Greek*, nor the *Grecian* Jews when they spoke *Latin*? Or do you suppose, that the apostles forgot to speak the *Jewish* language at all?

But St. *Peter* himself decides the question, and at the beginning of his discourse tells, expressly, to whom he is addressing it. YE MEN OF JUDEA, AND ALL YE THAT DWELL AT JERUSALEM, *bearken to my words*: ACTS ii. 14. *And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.*

heaven. Acts ii. 4. He preached to the whole multitude, and the whole multitude consequently understood the language in which he spoke. It was the *Jewish* language.

5thly; I observe, that this is the language which the multitude mean, when they say, *We hear, every man, in our own tongue*, διαλεκῶ, *wherein we were born*. Acts ii. 8. They mention and they mean but *one*. It was *that* in which they were all born, let them be born in what country you please. They do not say, they do not intend to say, *We hear, every man, in the tongue of the nation in which he was born*. What they say is, *We hear, every man, in the tongue in which we were born; that is, in the Jewish tongue*. This was the τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλεκῶ ἡμῶν, the proper language of us; the native language of every *Jew*: and this is the very phrase which the historian uses to denote that language, in Acts i. 19. *That field is called Aceldama, τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλεκῶ αὐτῶν, in their proper tongue*.

6thly; I observe lastly, that this was the language which the apostles spoke. *Every man heard them speak in his own language*: Acts ii. 6. *We hear, every man, in our own tongue*, (διαλεκῶ, language) *in which we were born*: Acts ii. 8.

How much difference there was between the language of the *Jews* and that of the *Galileans*, I cannot tell. That there was a difference is certain, from what the damsel said to *Peter*, Matth. xxvi. 69, 73. *Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. Surely, thou also art one of them; for thy speech betrayeth thee.* And that there was a considerable difference, it is natural to conclude, from the surprize which the multitude expressed, when they heard the apostles, who were *Galileans*, speak the *Jewish* language with so much propriety. *Are not all these which speak Galileans? and how bear we, every man, in our own tongue, wherein we were born?* Acts. ii. 2. We perceive by their speech that they are *Galileans*; but they speak the *Jewish* language much better than we should have expected *Galileans* to do. Or their meaning may be, What makes these *Galileans* to talk the *Jewish* language? Why do not they talk *Galilean*, their native language, amongst themselves; why this affectation of talking ours? Nor can I tell by what means, or at what time, the apostles learnt to speak the *Jewish* language. I can say only, that they did not speak it now for the first time. Their frequent conversations
with

with the *Jews*, during our Saviour's ministry, abundantly prove that they could speak it before the day of Pentecost.

It is plain enough thus far, at least for any thing which appears to the contrary, that the apostles spoke, and the multitude heard, but *one* language: the language of the *Jews*. The truth of each division in this graduated argument, is justified by the express authority of that very passage which is supposed to be so favourable to the common hypothesis; and you will grant that, though I should be in the wrong, it is possible I may be in the right.

But you have scarce granted it, when casting your eye on the eleventh verse, you instantly retract the hasty concession; for you read there, that fifteen different nations exclaim with astonishment, as with one breath, *We do hear them speak in our TONGUES the wonderful works of God.* And you object unto me, that if our own *tongue*, wherein we were born, means, as I affirm, but one language, yet surely our *tongues*, in this verse, must mean more languages than one. I deny that it means so many as one.

The

The apostles not only spoke the *Jewish* language, but they spoke also in *tones*. We do hear them speak in our *tongues*, not *διαλέκτοις*, but *γλωσσαῖς*, *tunes* or *musical notes*. —Nothing certainly can seem more natural, or more rational to an *English* reader, than to conclude, that if our *tongue* at the eighth verse means our language, our *tongues* at the eleventh must mean our languages; yet nothing can be clearer to me, than that the two words mean two very different things. They are two different words, at least in the original; and if they had been rendered by two different words into *English*, the mere *English* reader might have suspected that they did not both convey the same idea.

If you ask me what ideas you are to form of these *tones*, *tunes*, or *musical notes*; it is sufficient, for an answer, to refer you to your own ear. Who cannot distinguish between a *tone* and a *word*; between a *tune* and a *song*; between *singing* and *speaking*? But it may be more satisfactory to you, to have a philosophical and precise account of the difference between them. Take it then, in the words of Mr. *Walker*, in his *Elements of Elocution*, vol. i. p. 115. “ All vocal sounds
“ may

“ may be divided into two kinds, namely,
 “ speaking sounds, and musical sounds. Mu-
 “ sical sounds are such as continue a given
 “ time on one precise point of the musical
 “ scale, and leap as it were from one note to
 “ another; while speaking sounds, instead
 “ of dwelling on the note they begin with,
 “ slide either upwards or downwards, to the
 “ neighbouring notes, without any percep-
 “ tible rest on any; so that speaking and
 “ musical sounds are essentially distinct; the
 “ former being constantly in motion from
 “ the moment they commence; the latter
 “ being at rest for some given time in one
 “ precise note.”

If you ask me whether the apostles spoke
 the *Jewish* language in *tones*, or spoke in
 tones without pronouncing any articulate
 words, I answer, I cannot determine. It
 should seem from some of *St. Paul's* expres-
 sions, in the fourteenth chapter of his first
 epistle to the *Corinthians*, that by speaking in
 a *tongue*, *γλωσσα*, he means speaking in a
 certain tone without any words at all; but
 I suppose that the apostles, on the day of
 Pentecost, uttered real and significant words;
 —they spoke their *tongue* in *tongues*. They
 spoke

spoke in the *Jewish* tongue, διαλεκτω; Acts ii. 8. But they spoke it in tones, γλωσσαις; Acts ii. 11. Be this as it might, it does not affect the general idea of speaking, γλωσσαις, in *tongues*, which is speaking in *musical notes*, either with or without words.

If you ask where was the mighty wonder that *Galileans* should be able to sing a few *Jewish tunes*? I answer, I do not wonder at it: they might have learnt the tunes, as they had learnt the language, long before the day of Pentecost. And I ask you in my turn, who ever did wonder at it? The wonder was, not that the apostles had the knowledge of the *Jewish tongues*, γλωσσαις, ver. viii. but that they should sing them in the *manner* and at the *time* they did. It was not the *ability* of speaking in *tongues*, but the *motive*, that occasioned all the astonishment. When I hear a religious family in my neighbourhood sing the praises of their Creator, at home on the evening of the Lord's day, I feel not the least emotion of surprise. It is what they use to do, and I know the motive; and yet if I should see them walking the street at midnight, and hear them singing at such an unseasonable hour, and in such an improper

improper place, I should naturally be astonished, and ask, *what meaneth this?* But how perversely would my surprise be construed, if any should infer from it, that I perceived something miraculous in their *knowledge* of the hymn or the tune.

There are indeed abundant intimations in this very chapter, that it was not merely the apostles speaking, either in the *Jewish language*, διαλεκῶ, ver. 6. or in *tones*, γλωσσais, ver. 11. but something unusual in the *circumstances* of their speaking, which raised the greatest astonishment. But, not to anticipate here the observations which will be introduced with more propriety in another place, I will turn my attention into a different line, and to different objects; and immediately enter on that series of arguments which evince the truth of this proposition;—*It is certain that speaking in tongues was not speaking languages; it is probable that it was speaking in tones.*

SECT. I. It deserves your consideration, that the common idea of the gift of tongues derives all its support from one single text. *We do hear them speak in our tongues:* γλωσσais. Acts ii. 11. If *speaking in tongues* means speaking

speaking in *languages*, it was not only a miracle, but a miracle of the first order. That men without education, without study, and without leisure, should know what are the arbitrary signs which people have agreed to use in order to express their thoughts;—that they should find, arranged in their brain, all at once, and independently on their will, words which have not any natural connection with their ideas;—that they should be able, all at once, to combine sounds after a new manner,—to adapt their organs of speech instantly to the pronunciation of them, and to speak with fluency, a language which they had never spoken before;—in short, to speak in the morning, languages, which but the evening before they were totally unacquainted with,—This certainly is a most astonishing miracle! And yet the only *seeming* proof of its existence, depends upon one single text; for if *tongues* does not mean *languages* here, there is no other proof that such a miracle was wrought.

A miracle of this magnitude, one would think, must frequently catch the mental eye, almost every where within the horizon of Christianity, and obtrude itself into the conversation

versation and writings both of the apostles and of their historian. And yet *not one* person is named with whom they conversed in an inspired language;—*not one* instance is recorded, where they spoke any language without having previously learnt it;—*not one* language is mentioned, of which they acquired the knowledge by an immediate communication from GOD;—*not one* sentence can be produced where they ever claimed such knowledge;—and the only text which is appealed to, is neither the words of the apostles, of the historian, nor yet of Christians; and at the same time so ambiguous, that it may mean *tunes* as well as *languages*; or rather so unambiguous, that if it *does not* mean *tunes*, it *cannot* mean *languages*. It is impossible to conceive that we should meet with the miracle of *languages* couched up only in one short sentence, and lying, as it were *incog.* in the accidental exclamation of the multitude, while no trace of it should be found in any other passage throughout all the New Testament. *Such* a miracle! and *such* a proof of it! The idea is inadmissible.

§. II. The supposition that γλωσσαις, *tongues*, in this text, signifies *tunes* and not *languages*, throws

throws considerable light on the context. On this supposition, I can give a reason why *διαλεκῶ* is used at the eighth verse, and *γλωσσαῖς* here: it is, because they signify two different ideas.—I can give a reason why the first is used in the singular number, and the other in the plural: it is, because they are intended to denote *one* language, and *many* tunes.—I can give a reason for the variation of the adjective, why *ἰδια* is employed before *διαλεκῶ*, and *ἐμείραῖς* before *γλωσσαῖς*: it is, because *τῇ ἰδια διαλεκῶ ἡμῶν* can mean but some *one* language which was common to all the multitude; whereas *ἡμείραῖς γλωσσαῖς* does *not* necessarily mean *one* peculiar set of tunes.—I can give a reason why the historian has twice mentioned, that the multitude was amazed at what they heard: it is, because they felt and expressed their amazement at two different times, and at two different objects. If the *Jews* were surprised to hear the apostles speak in the *Jewish* language, it was to be expected, that they would be also surprised to hear them speak in *Jewish* tunes. And it turns out according to expectation. They express their surprise to hear them speak in their *language*,

at the seventh and eighth verses; where it is said, *They were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold! are not all these which speak Galileans? and how hear we, every man, in our own tongue, (διαλεκῶ, language) wherein we were born?* And they express their surprise to hear them speak in their tunes, at the eleventh and twelfth verses; where it is said, *We do hear them speak in our tongues, γλωσσais, and they were all amazed, and in doubt, saying, What meaneth this?—*I can give a reason why the profelytes from Rome did not say with the Jews, in the first exclamation, *We hear in our own TONGUE, διαλεκῶ, wherein we were born;* yet join themselves to them in the second, and say, *We do hear them speak in our TONGUES, γλωσσais:* it is, because they could not call the Jewish language *their* native language; but there was a sense in which they could, as profelytes, call the Jewish tunes *their* tunes.—I can give a reason why the multitude, in the first exclamation, after saying *our tongue, διαλεκῶ,* add, *in which we were born;* but add no such words after *our tongues, γλωσσais,* in the second; it is, because that clause would be as improper after *tunes,* as it is proper after *language.*

Who

Who ever heard of *tunes* in *which* a *person* was *born*? and who has not heard of “native language?”——I can give a reason why the historian, or the people, enumerates the different countries from which they had come, *not* when they say at the eighth verse, *We bear, every man, in our own TONGUE*; but at the eleventh verse, when they say, *We do bear them in our TONGUES*; it is, because the wonder, that the apostles should be heard by every man in his own *language*, had no connection with the number, or countries, of the multitude who heard them, as it was a language which was common to them all; but the wonder, that *all* should hear them in their own *tunes*, had a necessary reference to the number and countries of those who heard them; as, in order to be heard by each in his own tunes, they must have spoken in a greater variety of tunes, the greater the number of nations which were present.——I can give a reason why the multitude expressed nothing but surprise, to hear the apostles speak in their *tongue*; but express *surprise*, *doubt*, and *curiosity* to hear them speak in their *tongues*: it is, because when they heard them speak in their *tongue*, διαλεκτω,

that is, *language*, a little transient surprise was the only sentiment which that could produce. They thought that *Galileans* could not speak the *Jewish* language so well; but they find that they were mistaken. There was no room to doubt any thing about the matter; no sense in saying, *what meaneth this?* But when they heard them speak in their *tongues*, *γλωσσais*, that is, *tunes*, there was room for *doubt* and *enquiry*, as well as for *astonishment*; and it was natural to ask, *what can this mean?*—I can give a reason, lastly, why some of the multitude concluded that the apostles were drunk, not because they spoke in their *tongue*, but because they spoke in their *tongues*. Those mockers, no doubt, were persons, indiscriminately, of every nation then present, who heard what was spoken as well as the rest, and who understood as much as the rest, of what they heard; but who, because the apostles spoke in *tongues*, in some remarkable *tones*, ascribed what they heard to the effects of wine.

But on the supposition, that *γλωσσais*, *tongues*, at the eleventh verse, is synonymous with *διαλεκῶ*, *language*, at the eighth,—no reason can be given why the same word should

should not be used in *both* verses;—no reason can be given why the number is varied from *tongue* to *tongues*;—no reason can be given why the adjective is changed from *idia* to *ἡμετέρας*, properly translated, the one simply *our*, and the other emphatically *our own*;—no reason can be given why the historian, or the multitude, should repeat the same exclamation of surprise at the distance of so few verses;—no reason can be given why the *profelytes* did *not* exclaim, with the *Jews*, *We bear them speak in our own TONGUE*; though they exclaimed, *We bear them speak in our TONGUES*;—no reason can be given why the words, “*in which we were born*,” which are immediately subjoined after “*our tongue*,” should not be subjoined after “*our tongues*”;—no reason can be given why the enumeration of the different countries, from which the multitude had come, is made only when they say, *We do bear them in our TONGUES*;—no reason can be given why they should *doubt*, and say, *What meaneth this?* when they observe that the apostles spoke in their *tongues*; but expresses no *doubt* or *curiosity* at all when they observe, that they spoke in their *tongue*; and, instead of saying, *What meaneth this?* ask a

very different question, *Are not these Galileans?*—no reason can be given why they should conclude, that the apostles were drunk, because they spoke in their *tongues*, and not conclude it as well because they spoke in their *tongue*;—and no reason can be given why they should draw such a conclusion at all.

The hypothesis which affords a satisfactory explanation of so many difficulties in this passage, all inexplicable on yours, and which, at the same time, involves us in none peculiar to itself, you will acknowledge, is at least plausible, and deserves a better fate than to be rejected without examination.

§. III. The words joined in construction with *γλωσσαις*, almost determine the question in favour of *tones*.

We read of *new tongues*. It is said prophetically of those who should be converted to Christianity, by the apostles, *They shall speak with new tongues*. Mark xvi. 17. New languages, you say: but new to *whom*? To the speakers, or to the hearers? They could not be *new* to those who understood them; and those who understood them not, could not know that they were *languages*. What perverseness!

perverseness! They were new to *themselves*. And what occasion then, I reply, to say *new* at all? To distinguish them, you will answer, from those *old* ones which they spoke before. It may be so. But why should the epithet be qualified? Why should not *new tongues* signify, tongues *absolutely new*,—new to the speakers—new to the hearers—and new to all the world. They shall speak in *tones never spoken in before*.

We read of *other tongues*. The apostles spoke with *other tongues*; Acts ii. 4. It was not said of *them*, that *they* should speak with *new tongues*, and those in which they spoke were *Jewish*; *ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις*, say the *Jews*, Acts ii. 11. If *ἡμετέραις* be indeed not an error, for I should find no great difficulty in supposing that the true reading is *ἐτεραίς*. The apostles, says the historian at verse the fourth, spoke, *ἐτεραίς γλώσσαις*, in *other tongues*; that is, in *other tones* than were vernacular or natural to them; and all the *Jews* from different nations heard them speak, *ἐτεραίς γλώσσαις*, in *other tongues*.

This expression occurs also in 1 Cor. xiv. 21, in a passage quoted by the apostle from *Isaiah* xxviii. 11. *The priest and the prophet*, says he,

he, have erred through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. To whom then, he asks, will God teach knowledge? or whom shall he make to understand doctrine? He answers, *Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts; for with stammering lips, and another tongue, will he speak to this people; that is, to these drunkards.* In St. Paul's comparison, for he quotes the text only allusively, the little children who speak with *stammering lips* and *other tongues*, are the Christians who spoke in *tongues*. But do little children, just weaned from the milk, speak *plain*? Do *stammering lips* mean distinct pronunciation? and *other tongues*, the hearer's *own* tongue? Surely the lisplings of a child, and the babblings of an infant, are not the happiest simile to denote the perfect knowledge and the proper elocution of various *languages*. And if there be any occasion to suppose, that *tongues* here is not to be understood *literally*, what can it signify but mere *sounds*?

We read often of *speaking* with tongues; but we never read of *understanding* them. What was our Saviour's promise? They shall *understand* new tongues? No. Only,
They

They shall *speake* in them. What was it that raised the astonishment of the Jews? That the apostles *understood* their tongues? No. Only, That they *spoke* them. Speaking, and not understanding them, is the universal expression. This is so evident and so remarkable, that some have concluded, the apostles spoke languages without understanding them. They were aware that not a single text could be found, which *seemed* to say that the speaker *understood* his tongues; but they were not aware that *tongues* might mean *tones*.

We read, that *whether they be tongues they shall cease*; (1 Cor. xiii. 8.) *παυσὸνῆαι*, *silence*, *rest*, or *pause*. The very terms which are used in musick at this day, and which, if they are at all applicable to language, are applicable to it not as *language*, but as mere *sound*. The figurative use of the word *tongue*, for *sound*, is so natural, that common speech affords a thousand instances of it; and the word, in this sense, is less metaphorical, and less distant from its literal signification, than when it is used for *language*.

We read of *γενη γλωσσων*, which is translated *DIVERSITIES of tongues*: 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28. But why *diversities*? *Διαίρεσεις* is the word

word which signifies *diversities*: it occurs three times in this very chapter, and it is properly translated. *Diversities of gifts*, verse the fourth. *Differences of administrations*, verse the fifth. *Diversities of operations*, verse the sixth. But *γενν* does not denote *variety* and *separation*; it denotes *kindred* and *affinity*, and means *genera*, or *kinds*, in contradistinction from the species. Now *family*, *consanguinity*, or *tribe*, is an idea which coalesces, I think, with *tones* or musical sounds, much more readily than with *languages*; because, though languages have an affinity or relation one to another, yet languages are not numerous enough to be classed into *genera* or *kinds*, and to be reckoned up by tribes and families. Every *Corinthian* Christian who spoke with tongues, was master of a *whole family* of languages! You will not, I suppose, affirm that they were all literally new, and created by a miracle on purpose to be conferred upon the *Corinthian* Christians. Where in the world, then, could providence pick them up?

Lastly; We read, in 1 John iii. 18, *Let us not love in word, neither in tongue*. The disjunctive *neither* more than seems to imply, that

that *word* and *tongue* are here not synonymous, and that the latter can mean neither *language*, nor yet literally the *member*; and what else can it mean but *tone*? Indeed it must mean *tone*, or at least it cannot mean *language*, if the apostle wrote correctly, and attended either to the signification of his conjunction, or to the propriety and exactness of his antithesis. *Let us not love in word, NEITHER in tongue, but in deed and in truth*—*deed* in opposition to *word*, and *truth* in opposition to *tongue*. Perhaps there were, among the Christians to whom he was writing, weak or false brethren, who appealed to their *cant* for the sincerity of their love; or weak and honest believers, who were disposed to consider this *cant*, as the effect of integrity and zeal, in those who made use of it; and he tells them, that neither verbal professions of regard, nor the affected *tone* of piety, are any indication of a benevolent heart.

§. IV. What evidence there does arise from the words in construction with *γλωσσα*, is, I think, clearly in favour of *tones*; but it is almost nothing compared with that which rises from the use of the two words *διαλεκτος* and

and γλωσσα. It is very remarkable, that throughout the New Testament; though both words are promiscuously translated *tongue*; yet wherever *tongue* necessarily means *language*, the Greek is always διαλεκτος. Witness the following passages: *That field is called in their proper tongue Aceldama.* Acts i. 19. *How hear we, every man, in our own tongue wherein we were born.* Acts ii. 8. *He spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue.* Acts xxi. 40. *When they heard that he spoke in the Hebrew tongue.* Acts. xxii. 2. *I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying, in the Hebrew tongue.* Acts xxvi. 14. These are all the passages in which the Greek word for *tongue* is διαλεκτος; and these are all the passages in which *tongue* necessarily signifies *language*.

With a reference to the gift of *speaking in tongues*, the word *tongue*, in either of its numbers, occurs about *four and twenty* times; once in *Mark*, four times in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and nineteen times in the first epistle to the *Corinthians*; but the Greek is always γλωσσα in some of its variations. If speaking in *tongues* means speaking in *languages*, is it not strange, that the Greek should never be διαλεκτος? Is it not natural to conclude,
from

from the universal exclusion of *διαλεκτος*, from the service of this gift, and the universal adoption of *γλωσσα*, that the two words have not precisely the *same* meaning?—that they have a *different* meaning?—that *γλωσσα* in the New Testament does not mean *language*, at least in reference to the gift of tongues?—and that *διαλεκτος*, which means *language*, was not the proper word to be joined to *λαλειν*, in speaking of the gift of *tongues*, because that gift was *not* the gift of languages.

Certainly there is some meaning, some propriety, some design, in this invariable use of these two words, and *I*, on Mr. *Byrom's* scheme, can give a very good explanation of it. But in what manner can *you* account for this universal antipathy to the use of *διαλεκτος*, where *speaking in tongues* is mentioned, and for this universal prejudice in favour of *γλωσσα*? You will not say that *διαλεκτος* is appropriated to the *Jewish*, and that *γλωσσα* denotes the *other* languages; because, on your scheme, *διαλεκτω*, in Acts ii. 8. (*We hear, every man, in our own tongue*) means, *every language*, for you suppose it to be synonymous with *γλωσσαις* at the eleventh verse; and

and γλωσσαις at the eleventh, on your scheme, means the *Jewish* as well as *other* languages, because the *Judean* and *Jerusalem* Jews, as well as the rest of the multitude, say, *We do hear in our tongues*. But if διαλεκτος and γλωσσα are synonyms here, what can be the reason why διαλεκτος is used no where besides in reference to *speaking in tongues*?

It is nothing to the purpose to reply, that the writers had their choice to use which word they pleased. *That* is the very circumstance on which my argument is founded. Why, I ask, on the supposition that they *might* employ, with equal propriety, *either* word, did they *not* employ *both* indiscriminately, and use διαλεκτος, sometimes at least, instead of γλωσσα? But they never confound them, never use them promiscuously, and in speaking of *tongues* always use γλωσσα. And yet, notwithstanding this predilection in favour of γλωσσα, they instantly drop it, and adopt the discarded διαλεκτος, whenever they have occasion to speak of real language, though it be their own and favourite language. Who will not infer from this, that it was not a matter of indifference which of the two words they used? Who will not infer,

infer, that the gift of *speaking in tongues* had as little connection with philology, as it had with *Paul's* journey to Damascus.

§. V. The first promise of the gift of speaking in *tongues* was delivered in very figurative language; *Ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost*. The evangelists, indeed, do not inform us in their gospels, that Jesus Christ ever delivered this promise; but they represent John the Baptist as delivering it, and saying, that Christ would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. And Theologians, *imitatores, servum pecus*, one after another, have always told us, that it meant, to be involved in calamities and persecutions. An extraordinary promise indeed! But Jesus Christ himself however did, as well as John, deliver the promise; and it meant not calamities and persecutions, but the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the principal effect of which was speaking in tongues. That Jesus Christ did repeat this promise, after John the Baptist, to his apostle, and that to be *baptised with the Holy Ghost*, signifies to be inspired to *speak in tongues*, appears incontestibly from *Peter's* words in
Acts

Acts xi. 16. Giving a reason to some *Jewish* Christians why he baptised *Cornelius* and his family who were heathens, he says, *As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning; then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptizd with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost.*

Ye shall be baptizd WITH, or rather IN, the Holy Ghost. Ye shall be immersed in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Ghost shall cover and surround you. *This is the figure;* but what is the reality or the effects designed to be represented? The arrangement of words, or ideas in the brain, and the miraculous talent of understanding *languages?* or the impressions of a divine enthusiasm on the heart, and those tumultuous and strong sensations which would naturally express themselves in *tones?* *Baptism in the Holy Ghost* suggests the idea of some general and mechanical influence on the whole frame, rather than that of a partial influence on the understanding.

§. VI. And the apostles, to whom this promise was made, never once had occasion to speak or write *any* language which they had

had *not* learnt in the usual way. The *twelve* were professedly the apostles of the *circumcision*, that is, of the *Jews*; and it is most evident from the book of the *Acts*, (a book compiled on purpose to record the travels and preaching of the first heralds of Christianity) that the *twelve* never preached to *any* people but to the *Jews* and *Samaritans*. Nay, it does not appear, from the only authentic memoirs which we have of their life, that any of the *twelve* ever departed from *Jerusalem*, except *Peter* and *John*, and they did not go beyond the limits of the holy land. *Peter*, indeed, at *Cesarea* preached to *Cornelius*, who was *not* a *Jew*; but there is no room to imagine that *Cornelius* did not understand the *Jewish* language; on the contrary, his long residence amongst the *Jews*—which I infer from his being of *good report among all the nations*; (*Acts* xi. 22.) and his acquaintance with the scriptures, which I infer from his *fearing God*—prove, that he understood the common language of *Judea*.

Even on the day of Pentecost, there was no occasion to use but one language, for all the multitude who heard the apostles understood the same language, as I have observed

D

already;

already; and it was *that* language, I observe *further*—it was *that* language, which made the three thousand converts, and not the speaking in *strange tongues*.

Paul, indeed, was the apostle of the *uncircumcision*, and preached to the *Gentiles*. But he must have understood *Greek* as well *Hebrew*, without any inspiration, as he was by parentage a *Jew*, and by birth a *Grecian*. And what language did *Paul* ever write or speak in, besides *Hebrew* and *Greek*? As a scholar, and as a subject of the Roman Empire, he might have understood a little *Latin*; and but little, I imagine, else his epistle to the *Latin* Christians would not have been written in the *Grecian* language. *Twelve* apostles to the *circumcision*, and but *one* to the *uncircumcision*. *Twelve* to the *Jews*, and one to *all* the world besides! What a disproportion! But the reason is plain: the *twelve* understood no language besides *Hebrew*, and *Paul* understood *Greek*.

To avoid all disputes foreign to the leading object of this Essay, I will readily grant, if you insist upon it, that *Peter*, *John*, *James*, and *Jude*, wrote in *Greek*. The concession does not at all affect the validity of my argument.

argument. What I assert is, and I assert it on the authority of their own panegyrist and historian, that before *Paul's* imprisonment at *Rome*, with an account of which the book of the *Acts* concludes, *not one* of the apostles spoke in any language which he had not acquired after the usual manner; for, until that time (whatever they did afterwards) the *twelve* spoke none besides *Hebrew*, and *Paul* none besides *Hebrew* and *Greek*. That they understood *Greek* twenty or thirty years after the day of Pentecost, is no proof that they understood it by inspiration. The gift of *tongues* was not conferred in order to enable the apostles to preach to every nation in its own language; and I conclude therefore, that it was *not* the gift of *languages*.

§. VII. Let us consider then what was the real design of this gift, and whether that design was best answered on your hypothesis or on mine. The design of it was to inspire the apostles and first Christians with zeal and fortitude in the cause of Christ. *Jesus*, says the historian, (*Acts* i. 4, 5.) *being assembled together with his apostles, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem,*

but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence. Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me. Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high. Luke xxiv. 49.

These two texts preclude the possibility of mistaking the proper use and intended effect of the effusion of the Holy Ghost; it was to inspire the apostles with ardour and intrepidity in their attachment to *Jesus Christ*; and the proper paraphrase of the words seems to be this: “*John* came to call men *only* to
 “repentance, and he baptized with water,
 “as an emblem of inward purity. I myself
 “came with more extensive views; not only
 “to preach repentance, but also to *bear wit-*
 “*ness to the truth*; and to enable me, to fulfil
 “this arduous commission, God conferred
 “upon me the Holy Ghost. You are to be
 “entrusted with the same commission, and
 “to be my witnesses to the world; ye are
 “now sincere, but ye are yet weak and timid.
 “Your future character, as the advocates of
 “my

“ my truth, calls for courage as well as for
 “ sincerity; and I will take care to supply
 “ you with it; *Ye shall be baptized with the*
 “ *Holy Ghost not many days hence.*

We have the same sentiment in our Saviour’s conversation with *Nicodemus*. You have often wondered, I dare say, what there was in *Nicodemus’s* profession of faith in Christ, to introduce the *new birth* in our Saviour’s reply, and to make him answer, *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* John iii. 5. But the observation was exceeding apposite, if by *spirit* we understand zeal and courage: “ Thy faith is just and excellent; but thou
 “ art weak and timid. To be my disciple,
 “ thou must be born of the spirit as well as
 “ of water. It is not enough that thou art
 “ a man of *integrity*, thou must be also a man
 “ of *intrepidity*, if thou wouldst enter into
 “ the kingdom of God.”

According to the general opinion of divines, the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, was to confer upon the apostles the gift of infallibility, the power of working miracles, or the gratuitous know-

ledge of languages. But what says the scripture? That it was to confer power and zeal, and nothing else; except what would be the necessary consequence of such zeal and power; which the knowledge of languages can never be supposed to be. The Holy Ghost (whether a person or a disposition, is not here the question) is represented as residing in the first Christians: and what was the manifestation of his residence in them? Their extraordinary knowledge? No. Their miracles? Never; at least, after a tedious search, I have not been able to find one text where miracles are ascribed to the Holy Ghost; they are ascribed to the Spirit of God, but not to the *Holy Spirit*. What then was the mark, the signal, or the manifestation, of the presence and residence of the Holy Ghost in men? It was *universally* their *speaking with boldness*. *Speaking* was the whole office of the Holy Ghost—*speaking boldly*; and it is upon this account that he is sometimes called the *Comforter*, or the *Advocate*.

That not extraordinary knowledge, or the working of miracles, but only *boldness of speech*, was the characteristick indication of the presence of the Holy Ghost, is most certain. Whether a person had or had not any

knowledge revealed to him, or the power of working miracles communicated to him, he had the Holy Ghost, if he spoke with an intrepid zeal. *The Holy Ghost shall teach you in that same hour what ye shall speak:* Luke xii. 12. *He shall testify of me:* John xv. 26. *He shall reprove the world:* John xvi. 8. That is, the Holy Ghost will enable you to assert and vindicate my cause and yours, and convert your cowardice into courage. *Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, Be it known to you all, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, doth this man stand here before you whole. Now, when they saw the BOLDNESS of Peter and John, they marvelled. Acts iv. 8—13. And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with BOLDNESS. Acts iv. 31. Look ye out among you seven men, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost; and they were not able to resist ^{the} wisdom and SPIRIT by which he spoke. Acts vi. 3. 10. Brother Saul, the Lord hath sent*

sent me, that thou mightest be filled with the Holy Ghost; and straightway Paul preached Christ in the synagogues, and increased the more in STRENGTH. ACTS ix. 17, 20, 22. Then Paul, filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on Elymas the forcerer, and said, O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right way of the Lord? ACTS xiii. 9, 10.

Can you hesitate to allow, after all this evidence, that speaking by the *Holy Ghost* means speaking with a divine power, with a holy confidence, and religious zeal? or, that the apostle's speaking in *other tongues*, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, means speaking in other tones than the low, the tame, the languid, and the timid ones, in which they had hitherto spoken of their beloved Lord? There was some real, necessary, and indissoluble connection between speaking by the Holy Ghost and the possession of courage: if they were not the same thing, they were most intimately related to each other; and the promise of the coming of the Holy Ghost meant, it is evident, the promise of being endowed with power ^{and} magnanimity. Indeed the conscious^{ness} of possessing

possessing a miraculous gift of languages might convince the apostles that God was with them, and be a motive or a reason to make them *willing* to be brave and bold; but something more than conviction in the mind is necessary to produce animation in the heart; and there is a vast difference between the actual possession of zeal, and the mere desire of possessing it. According to my ideas of the gift of tongues, it was as naturally connected with heroism, as an effect is connected with its cause. It was a proof and a pledge unto the apostles, that they were under the inspiration of God—that the promise was already fulfilled—and that the power from on high was in fact received. In short, this gift, on the common opinion, was only a motive to be courageous; on mine, it was courage itself. And all scripture declares for me, that speaking by the Holy Ghost, was speaking from some secret energy and efficacious impulses, which either caused or accompanied a daring zeal; from zeal to tones, the transition is easy and natural; but how zeal could produce the instantaneous knowledge of languages, I shall leave you at your leisure to explain.

§. VIII. And what were the emblems of this gift? A rushing wind, and tongues of fire. On my hypothesis, they are natural, significant, and expressive emblems; because they are emblems of that animated zeal, that forcible assurance, and those impetuous passions, which would impel the apostles to speak in *tones*. We perceive some analogy, some propriety, between the allusive picture and the actual event alluded to. A *rushing wind*, and *tongues of fire*, are an apt and a happy representation of that impassioned vehemence which bears down all before it, and of that intense enthusiasm which breathes and burns in every word.

But on your hypothesis these emblems have no meaning at all. What has a *rushing wind* to do with the arrangement of ideas or words in the brain; or *tongues of fire* with the talent of understanding a little *Greek* or *Latin*, without having learnt it? If these were the effects, which the effusion of the Spirit was to produce, and which were designed to be prefigured by those emblems, then any thing may be an emblem of any thing; for the most vivacious fancy cannot point out here one feature of resemblance between

between the occult representation and the object to be represented.

Well; you say, Cannot this *wind* and these *tongues* be as truly emblematical of the ardours of enthusiasm, on the common scheme, as they are on mine? No, I reply, they cannot. It was in the power of God, no doubt, to give boldness to the apostles in what manner He pleased; and it was possible for Him, for ought I know, to communicate unto them the gift of *courage*, at the *same time* that you *suppose* He communicated to them the gift of *languages*. But your poor emblems are not at all relieved by the supposition that the gift of *tongues* and the gift of *courage* were *two* distinct gifts, because *they* are still emblems of the gift of *tongues*. The effusion of the spirit was to produce *one* precise and determinate effect, and to communicate but *one* single and defined gift; that was, speaking in *tongues*. It is of *this* gift that the rushing wind and flaming tongues were emblems, and not of that *other* gift which, you suppose, was communicated by some *other* means, and in *another* way; and they are no emblems at all of this gift, if *tongues* means *languages*. The text, it is
true,

true, does not expressly say that they were emblems; but what else could they be? They preceded speaking in tongues; they preceded it but an instant, and they were in some view or other connected with it: they were not the proper causes of it; and if they were, wind and fire have no more connection with the knowledge than they have with the ignorance of languages. As proper causes, what effects could they produce, but some alteration in the muscular frame, in the tension of the passions, in the organs of sense, or in the accents of speech? And as prefigurations, similitudes, or significant omens, what could they represent but the same effects; the enthusiasm of speaking in tongues?

And there appeared unto them, says our translation, CLOVEN tongues like as of fire: but the sentence may be translated; And there appeared, DIVIDED, unto them tongues like as of fire. However, let us retain the word *cloven*, and suppose it to be an attribute of these tongues; What mysterious meaning can it contain? Tongues of fire, or of flame, would naturally appear cloven or divided; or if their being *cloven* or divided was symbolical of any thing, it was symbolical only
of

of the *cloven, divided, or indistinct* manner in which the apostles would speak. So far from being an emblem, that either of them would speak two or three languages at once, it was an emblem that he would not speak one clearly and distinctly; but confusedly, unintelligibly, and as if he spoke with a cloven or a double tongue. It was an emblem that he would speak in tones.

§. IX. It is a circumstance very unfavourable to the common opinion, that the disciples on the day of Pentecost began to speak in tongues when they were yet by themselves, *some time* before the multitude assembled; and as far as appears, when they had not the *least* expectation that any multitude *at all* would assemble. *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues.* Acts ii. 4. It was by mere chance that the multitude assembled. *Now when this was noised abroad, or, more literally, when this noise was made, the multitude came together.* Acts ii. 6. Whether it was the noise of the *rustling wind*, or the noise of the apostles *speaking*, it was some *noise* which somebody accidentally heard in the house, and happened

to mention unto others, that raised the people's curiosity, and led them to assemble round the disciples. If the gift of *tongues* was the gift of *languages*, to enable them to speak to every nation in its own language, Why did they speak in *tongues* before any were present to hear them? What end could they possibly propose to themselves, to declaim aloud in various languages, without one hearer present to attend to them? Was it to examine the goodness of the gift; to try how well they could use it; or to rehearse in readiness against the time when they should have occasion to preach in earnest?

According to my opinion of it, the gift was designed for the comfort and confirmation of believers, and had no immediate reference at all to the advantage of unbelievers. It meant those strong and overbearing influences, which fill the heart with all the power of enthusiasm, and which impel the tongue in all the raptures of devotion, to utter melody and praise in *preconceived tunes*, or *extemporary tones*, suited to the feelings of the speaker. The apostles spoke when they were by themselves, because what they spoke regarded no person but God and themselves.

And

And they spoke in *tones*, because they spoke as they felt themselves affected. They magnified God, for his *wonderful works*, in *musical notes*.

§. X. It is another circumstance equally unfavourable to the common opinion, that the disciples, who spoke in *tongues* on the day of Pentecost, spoke *all* at the same time. *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues.* Acts ii. 4. *They ALL BEGAN to speak*; that is, they all began to speak *together*, or before either of them had finished speaking. The phrase will not admit of any other meaning: it is the only meaning which it bears, or can bear, in common speech, and ingenuity; or even perverseness itself, will never be able, by all the tortures of criticism, to make it confess that it ever meant *order* and *succession*. *Are not ALL these which speak Galileans?* Acts ii. 7. *We do hear THEM speak in our tongues.* Acts ii. 11. These hearers did not mean that they *understood* all that the disciples spoke; that was impossible. But they declare, unequivocally, that they heard them *all* speak; and they declare this the *very moment* they assembled

assembled round them. *Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard THEM speak in his own language.* Acts ii. 6. The inference is unavoidable; they must speak *all* at the same time.

This circumstance is pointed out to us also in two other accounts which this historian gives of the collation of this gift. *While Peter was yet preaching to Cornelius and his friends, The Holy Ghost (says the text, Acts x. 44, 46.) fell on ALL them which heard the word; and they who came with Peter heard THEM speak with tongues.* When Paul had laid his hands upon certain *Epheſian* diſciples, *the Holy Ghost came on THEM, and THEY ſpake with tongues; and all the men were about twelve.* Acts xix. 6, 7.

Not a doubt can remain, but that the apoſtles on the day of Pentecoſt ſpoke *all* at *once*. And do you find in this circumſtance an argument in favour of languages? Was *this* the way to *apply* the miraculous talent of languages? Was *this* the way to exhibit the miracle in its *genuine* greatneſs? Was *this* the way to make *converts*? Was *this* the way even to be *underſtood* at all? There
needs

needs an *Elias* to reconcile the *manner* in which the gift of *tongues* was exercised with the *idea* of its being the gift of *languages*.

Aukward and unaccountable as this is, on your scheme, it is, on mine, natural and proper. The apostles did not *intend* to be understood by others. They were borne away by an impetuous torrent of inspiration, and in the transports of a divine delirium, expressing the devout feelings of hearts devoted unto God. It was natural to do this in *tongues*, in simultaneous *tones*, or in pre-composed *tunes*. They spoke *all* at the *same time*, because they *all* at the *same time* felt the impulses of the spirit; or because when one began to speak, and the sweet airs of paradise vibrated on the social and religious ear, the contagion would inevitably become general; and, by a sympathy, however ill-understood in its cause, universally experienced in its effects, would instantly be communicated from tongue to tongue, and from heart to heart.

§. XI. The apostles spoke in *tongues as the spirit gave them* UTTERANCE. *Αποφθεγγομαι*, the word which is here translated *utterance*,

E

is

is used only twice besides in the New Testament; in *Acts* ii. 14, where it is translated, simply, to say; *Peter lifted up his voice, and said*; and in *Acts* xxvi. 25, where it is translated to *speake forth*; *I am not mad, most noble Festus, but SPEAK FORTH the words of truth and soberness*. But the proper signification of it is obvious enough, both from its primitive *φθεγγομαι*, which means *clamo, sonum edo*, and from those strong emotions in which *Peter lifted up his voice, and Paul spoke forth*. It is to speak with *vehemence* and *enthusiasm*: this, no doubt, was the manner in which *Peter* spoke, when he *lifted up his voice* to refute the charge of drunkenness produced against him and the other disciples. And, no doubt, but this was the manner in which *Paul* made his defence before *Festus*. It appears to me, that *Festus* concluded *Paul* to be mad, from the manner of his delivery, as much as from the subject of his discourse. No, says the apostle, *I am not mad*. My subject, are “*words of truth and soberness*,” and my manner, the effect of *zeal and vehemence*.

They spoke as the Spirit gave them UTTERANCE. Why utterance? If they spoke different languages, surely the expression ought to

to have been, as the Spirit gave them *ideas*, or at least as it gave them *words*. What difference could it make, as far as the mere *power* of utterance was concerned, whether they spoke in *Hebrew* or in *Welch*? That *power* they had before; and it would remain always the same, and suffer no alteration from the Spirit, let them speak what *language* they would. Was it necessary to pronounce an *inspired* language louder, more distinctly, or with greater emphasis, than it was to pronounce their *native* language? Can any reason, any phantom of a reason, be assigned, why the very same power of speech which was sufficient for the delivery of an oration in *Hebrew*, should *not* be sufficient for the delivery of the same oration in *Greek* or *Latin*? If *other tongues* be equivalent to *other languages*, where is the propriety of the remark, or where is the foundation for it, that the apostles spoke *with other tongues*, as the Spirit gave them *utterance*? What *other utterance*, what other force or vehemence, did it require to speak in *foreign* tongues, than it did to speak in their *own* tongue? For I suppose you will allow that none of them spoke more than one language at a time: if

either of them spoke three or four languages at once, the case would be very different.

Utterance however is the word; and on my interpretation of *tongues*, it is the right word, because the whole miracle consisted in the *manner* of utterance. They spoke in *tones* as the Spirit gave them *zeal* and *vehemence*. Speaking a language in *tones*, it is obvious, is a very different thing from speaking it *without tones*: it necessarily presupposes strong passions and animated feelings, and it would of course be attended with expressive gestures. Thus it was on the day of Pentecost. Speaking in *tongues* presented something remarkable to the *eyes* as well as to the *ears* of the multitude. There was something in the exercise of the gift to be seen as well as to be heard. And *Peter* makes an apology for the *gestures* of the speakers as well as for their *tones*. He ascribes both to the same cause. *Jesus hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.* Acts ii. 23.

§. XII. It appears to me also exceeding probable, that it was the noise of the apostle's speaking in *tongues* which made the multitude to assemble. *Now when this was noised abroad,*

abroad, the multitude came together; Acts ii. 6. that is, *began* to come together, for we are not to suppose that the whole multitude met at the same instant. *When this was noised abroad* means, according to the translators' idea, when this was *rumoured* abroad; that is, the news that the apostles were speaking in other tongues: but how came the first person to know that they were speaking in other tongues? Certainly because he heard them. But how came they to be heard at all out of the house where they were assembled? It was *because* they spoke in tongues. So that our translation justifies my inference, that it was the noise of the apostles' speaking which drew the people at first to the apostles' chamber.

But though the translators say, *When this was noised abroad*; what the historian says is a very different thing: his words are, γενομένης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, *when this NOISE was made*; and by *noise* he means not *rumour*, *news*, or *fame*, but *mere noise*. Φωνή, in the New Testament, universally signifies either *vox* or *sonitus*, *voice* or *sound*: it signifies *vox*, human voice, or the resemblance of it, twenty times for one that it signifies *sonitus*, or mere sound;

and it *never* signifies *fama*, *rumor*, *report*, or *news*. All the question then is, What noise this was? You may say that it was the sound of the rushing wind mentioned at the fourth verse; but you will say so, not only *without* evidence, but *against* all the evidence which the context affords. How could the transient sound of the wind, in the air, be any direction to guide them to the apostles; or if it proceeded from the house where the apostles were assembled, it does not follow that the multitude could judge from *what* house it proceeded; for here analogy and experience could be of no service to them, as they had never heard such a sound before. But there is no room to suppose that they *heard* this rushing *wind* at all. You will grant that they did not *see* the *fiery tongues*; and they were no more interested in the former than in the latter. The *only* noise which the historian says they wondered at, was that of the apostles' *speaking*; and they enquire into the cause of no other. Besides, "*this noise*" should, in grammar, refer to that which was mentioned *last*, and which is *nearest* to it—to the sound of the *tongues* at the fourth verse, and not to the sound of the
wind

wind at the second verse. And what is still more conclusive, the sound of the *wind* from heaven, at the fourth verse, is called *ηχος*, whereas "*this noise*," at the sixth, is called *φωνη*.

Now if it be probable in any degree that it was the noise of the apostles speaking with *other tongues* which first brought any part of the multitude together, it is in the *same degree* probable, that speaking in *tongues*, was speaking in *tones*. Why were they heard after they began to speak with *tongues* any more than they were before when they spoke their *common tongue*? There was no cause, mechanical or moral, why they should speak one language louder than another; or why they should be heard at a greater distance in an inspired than in their native language. But every person can perceive, that they would be heard much further when they *sung* than when they *talked*; not only because each of them would naturally speak louder, but also, because all of them spoke at the same time; and that the multitude, who did not hear a syllable, or a sound, when they spoke the vernacular language in the *usual manner*, would instantly hear them when they begun
to

to speak it in *tunes*, and assemble to the place to enquire into the cause or motive of so extraordinary a phenomenon. The apostles were not linguists, and their *tongues* meant nothing less than *languages*.

§. XIII. The apostles on the day of Pentecost, in speaking with *tongues*, did not address themselves at all to the *multitude*; they spoke only to God, or in monologues to themselves. They had *begun* to speak before the multitude assembled; what they spoke therefore could not be intended for the multitude: they continued to speak on after the multitude had assembled; but they did not direct any discourse to them. *We do hear them speak*, say the multitude: *We do hear them speak*, but they do not speak to us; they take no notice of us. *We do hear them speak the wonderful works of God*: Acts ii. 11. Can this be the language of persons who are pointedly and pathetically addressed by a publick speaker; and to whom he is directing his discourse in the second person? If the apostles were preaching to them, could the multitude feel themselves at leisure to converse one with another, and to make their observations

observations on the speakers? It should not seem so from that earnestness with which they attended to the sermon which *Peter* preached to them. And what could be the reason why the *eleven* should not have been able to make *one* convert, when *Peter*, by his discourse, converted *three thousand* people? But it is evident enough from the exordium, as well as from the subject of that discourse, if we had no other evidence, that it was the *first* sermon addressed on that day to the people, and that *none* of the apostles had at that time preached to them *before*. Indeed from every account which the New Testament gives us of speaking in *tongues*, it may be inferred, that the speakers never addressed themselves to those who might be present, but spoke the varied movements of their hearts only to God and to themselves. And with respect to *Cornelius* and his friends, the historian in effect says, that they did *not* speak to the company; for his language is, *The Holy Ghost fell upon them; and they, that is, the company, heard them speak with tongues.* Acts x. 46.

If the apostles' *other tongues* were real languages, and if the multitude did not all understand

understand the same language, and if the apostles had these languages to qualify them to speak intelligibly to the multitude, why did they *not* speak to them? Why did they not propose to them some doctrine to be believed, or some precept to be observed; some virtue to be acquired, or some vice to be abandoned? But they neither teach, exhort, nor rebuke. They prove nothing; they affirm nothing; they say not one word to the multitude; the multitude hear them speak, and that is all. Were *they* so elated with the gift, that they forgot to what purpose it was conferred upon them? or, are *you* mistaken in the interpretation of it?

Moved by the Holy Ghost, and overborne by those impulses which they had neither ability nor inclination to repress, they began to speak in *tones*. The multitude heard them, and assembled round them: but they continued to speak on, without shame or fear. They were too much in earnest to attend to other objects. They were neither interrupted, nor yet disturbed in their soliloquies, by the impertinent curiosity of the multitude. They were expressing the devout feelings of their hearts. They had nothing to
say

say to the multitude, and they were perhaps insensible of their presence.

§. XIV. If we consider the *effects* which the apostles' speaking had on the multitude, we shall think it much more probable, that they spoke in *tones*, than that they spoke in *languages*. Those effects were, *astonishment, doubt, and contempt*. *And they were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, what meaneth this? Others mocking, said, These men are full of new wine.* Acts ii. 12, 13. If it be fair to guess at the cause from the effects, we must conclude, that the cause of these effects was speaking in *tones*; for this alone was sufficient to produce them: it must have produced *these* effects, and it could have produced no *other*.

According to my ideas of this affair, the apostles spoke the *Jewish* language in certain *tones*. They spoke together, all, at the same time, with great vehemence, and perhaps without being conscious that they were speaking at all; and with those gesticulations, which might perhaps transgress the rules of strict propriety; but they did not speak to the multitude. The multitude
might

might hear a word now and then, but it was impossible that they should be able to make any sense of what they heard.

That the multitude heard nothing intelligible and distinct, is most certain from the two very different and almost opposite opinions, into which they were divided, respecting the *character* of the *speakers*, and of their *tongues*. One part affirmed, that the apostles were speaking the *wonderful works of God*; and the other affirmed, that the apostles were *drunk*. The one said, that these *tongues* were the effect of the inspiration of God; and the other, of the inspiration of *wine*. The one said, that it was a *religious assembly*; and the other, that it was a *bacchanalian rout*. Opinions so different could not be entertained by persons who understood all that they heard, and who heard plain and connected discourses. The apostles must have selected their subjects most injudiciously indeed, and delivered them in a manner most unaccountably strange, to puzzle their hearers to such a degree as this, and to render it doubtful whether what they spoke was the sober language of devotion, or the idiot-gabble of ebriety.

Speaking

Speaking *languages* could never produce contempt and the suspicion of drunkenness. Say not that the mockers did not understand an apostle when he spoke in a language different from theirs: for without repeating here, what I have replied before to this evasive answer, and without observing how easy and how natural it was for them, when they did not understand him, to ask the rest, whether they understood him, as there was *one* language which was common to them *all*, and in which they all could converse one with another, let me now ask only, Did these mockers understand him when he spoke in their own language? If they heard him speak like a *sober* man, in that language, how could they imagine that the next minute he was *drunk*? They saw that he did not drink *there*. And if they perceived that he was *sober* when he spoke *Hebrew*, they could not conclude that he was *drunk* when he spoke *Greek*, whether they understood him or not.

And the gift of languages, as it could not produce those effects, which were actually produced on the hearers, so it must have produced others, which however were not produced.

produced on the minds of any. Mark the sentiments with which they are impressed, when *Peter* preaches to them. See the profound attention which they give to his sermon. They are all silence, and speak not a word one to another. See the respect which they shew to his person. They neither interrupt him, nor even in a whisper ask, *Is not this a Galilean?* See the docility with which they receive his instruction. Three thousand of them become converts to Christianity; and though some remain unconverted, yet none of them mocking, says, *This man is full of new wine.* Why did not the discourses of the other apostles have the same effects upon the multitude as *Peter's* discourse had? Did they carry less conviction with them, because they were delivered in an inspired language? The other apostles delivered no discourses, they only spoke in *tones* to God and to themselves.

§. XV. I proceed to *Peter's* defence of himself and of the eleven; and that furnishes me with another argument against the common opinion, and in favour of Mr. *Byrom's*. He denies, that their speaking with *tongues* was

was the effect of drunkenness, and then he points out the real cause of it. His method was natural and regular.

These men are full of new wine. A charge so odious required to be refuted; and a charge, on *your* scheme, so palpably false, it was easy to refute. Nothing more was necessary than to appeal to the audience at large. *Peter* might have said to the accusers, "You say that we are drunk, because you did not understand us when we spoke in a language different from your own; but you heard us speak in your *own* language: Did we then shew any symptom of drunkenness? And why do ye not ask those who understand other languages, whether we really talked those languages, or only talked an unintelligible jargon. I appeal to all the multitude, if some of them did not *always* understand us, and if every *individual* has not heard us speak in his *own* language. That ye should not know from what source we have derived our skill in languages, is very excusable; but nothing can excuse the perverseness and absurdity of attributing it to drunkenness."

This,

This, or something like it, *Peter* might have said; but what did he say? What were those strong reasons which he adduced to prove the falsehood of the charge, and to confound the adversaries? Instead of weakening his cause by a multiplicity of arguments, he collected his whole strength into *one* point, and rested his defence upon the evidence which would arise from *one single fact*. *These are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing: seeing what? Seeing they talk sober sense? Seeing they reason well in good Persick, Greek, and Latin? Seeing they speak with fluency, languages which they have never learnt, and which they have never spoke before? No. But seeing it is but the third hour of the day.* Acts ii. 15. In the name of wonder, wisdom, common sense, and every thing human, except absolute idiotism, what did *Peter* mean? Did he intend to turn evidence against himself, and by the weakness of his reasoning to justify the suspicion of his accusers? or, did he intend to defend himself? What charm then stupified his brain? What evil demon fascinated his senses? To offer *such* an argument to refute an infamous accusation, when he *might* have offered *such* another.

another. To produce an argument of straw, weak and light, and hollow as the worthless stuff which gives it its name, when he might have produced conclusive proof and demonstration! For how much less than demonstration would it have been, when the whole company declared, that *some* of them *always* understood what the apostles spoke.

But, on my scheme, the only defence which *Peter* could make was that which he actually made. The mockers accused the apostles of drunkenness, *because* they heard them speak in their *tongues*, in some peculiar *tones*; and there was no way of refuting the accusation, but by observing how improbable it was that they should be drunk so *early*. It was in vain to appeal to the *tongues* in which they had spoken, for on those *very tongues* was the suspicion and the charge founded.

Having denied that ebriety was the cause of the strange phenomenon, the apostle proceeds to explain the real cause of it, which was, the effusion of the Spirit of God according to the prophecy of *Joel*.

§. XVI. And that prophecy, of which speaking in *tongues* is declared to be the accomplishment,

F

complishment, seems much more to favour my hypothesis than yours. It is in *Joel* ii. 28; and is quoted by *Peter* in *Acts* ii. 17. *This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants, and on my hand-maidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy.* Is there any thing in these words which has the most distant reference to a miraculous talent of understanding various *languages*? Is it probable, is it possible, that the meaning of the promise should be “I will make polyglot speakers of you; you shall all talk Greek, and Latin, and Celtic, and what not?” Does dreaming dreams signify declining a *Latin* noun; or seeing visions, conjugating a *Greek* verb? And prophesying, whatever it means, can never mean the knowledge of *languages*.

The prophet describes the effects of the Spirit not on the understanding or the memory, but on the imagination, on the passions, and on the animal frame. He describes effects

effects which have no relation to the understanding of languages, which are utterly incompatible with the cold and regular arrangement of ideas or words in the brain, and which must disqualify a person, in some measure, for speaking, as well as he otherwise might, that language which he understood already.

Peter accounts for the apostles speaking in *tongues*, by saying that it was the accomplishment of this prophecy. On my theory he accounts for it *naturally* and *rationaly*; on yours he does not account for it *at all*. On mine, the prophecy was *really* and *literally* fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; on yours, it had no necessary or immediate reference to that day: on mine, it was by the apostle produced with strict justice and propriety; on yours, it is nothing to the purpose.

§. XVII. Turning now from the day of Pentecost, let us advert to our Saviour's promise or prediction of this gift to all believers, in *Mark* xvi. 17. *They shall speak with new tongues*. In an obscure village, and in a distant corner of *Judea*, a *Jewish* cottager turns Christian, and is inspired with the

knowledge of *new* languages. *What* is he to speak in them? Any thing which relates to the common concerns of the world, or only the things which relate to religion and to God? *When* is he speak in them? At home, daily, and in the market-place, or only on holy days, on Sundays, in the church, and upon some extraordinary occasions? To *whom* shall he speak in them? His neighbours, who are unbelievers, and who understand no language but their own, cannot understand a syllable of them, nor even tell whether he talks real languages or mere gibberish. How *many* does he speak in? *New tongues*, I should think, must mean three or four at least. And do you imagine, that the first believers in general were enabled, each, to speak three or four new *languages*? How shall he *be sure himself* that he does in reality speak them? How shall he satisfy himself, that the sounds which he utters are *Latin* words, or *Greek* words, or the words of *any* language? “He must take some opportunity to speak to them before his fellow “*Christians*, who are inspired to speak new “languages too.” But there are no Christians besides himself in the place; and if there
“were,

were, *they* might not be inspired with the knowledge of the *same* precise languages with *him*. What then shall he do? "He must send to *Rome* and *Athens* for proper books, and read them." But the poor man cannot read. "Why then he must go himself to *Greece* and *Italy*, and converse with the natives." And must he take similar methods to satisfy himself about the reality of his *other* two languages? What a plague these *new* tongues must be to him.

Our Saviour, by the promise, intended to convey to believers some kind of comfort. But how little, at best, does it amount to on the common idea! Go, my apostles; Go, and preach my gospel to every creature. Persuade people, by every argument, to believe in me. Bid them not be discouraged by the hatred and persecutions of the world. Display before them the consolations of Christianity: tell them, that I will enable them to speak in *Greek*, in *Arabic*, and in *Welsh*.

But on my idea of it, speaking in *new* tongues had a most significant meaning, and conveyed a most consolatory promise. The man who spoke with all the glow of enthusiasm, in the most fervent tones, must be

moved by some extraordinary impulses, and possess that bold and daring vehemence which would raise him superior to the sense of difficulties. He could never doubt the existence and reality of his own feelings; and the preternatural sensations which he felt would be unto him a perpetual source of zeal and comfort.

§. XVIII. According to our Saviour's promise, and the prophet's prediction, the gift of speaking in *tongues* was conferred upon private Christians and believers in general, as well as upon the apostles; not indeed upon every *individual*, but indiscriminately, and without distinction of *rank* or *office*. It is most probable that it was conferred, on the day of Pentecost, not only upon the twelve apostles, but upon the hundred and twenty disciples. It is certain that it was conferred upon the *Samaritan* believers, *Acts* viii. 17; upon some *Ephesian* believers, *Acts* xix. 6; upon *Cornelius* and all his family; and upon many in the *Corinthian* church. And *Peter* promises it to all in general. *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* *Acts* ii. 38.

Will any person be so weak as to assert, that all these believers had this gift to qualify them to become missionaries of the gospel in foreign parts? It was actually conferred upon private Christians, upon those who were never to be called to preach at all, and who could never have occasion to speak *any* language but their *own*: it was not therefore the gift of *languages*. How far it may be right to argue, by analogy, from nature to miracles, I cannot tell: but if the author of nature and the author of miracles be the same being, and have a consistent character, it is not easy to imagine that he acts, in these two departments of his works, upon principles diametrically opposite. See the wonderful fabrick of the universe; and mark the wisdom and œconomy which every where appear! How simple the laws which govern all its phenomena! How few the causes which produce that variety of effects, so beautiful and so useful! No more laws are established, no more causes are employed, or indeed can exist, than are absolutely necessary to work out the designed end; nor is there one atom more in the composition of this earth than was necessary to make the earth
to

to be what it is! Turn now and contemplate the gift of tongues. Is it credible that God, by an immediate communication from himself, should confer upon thousands of private Christians, the knowledge of various languages, which they never should have occasion to speak as long as they lived? Is it credible that He, who in the operations of nature is so frugal, should in his miraculous operations be so profuse; and all to no effect? Is it credible that God, who does nothing in vain, should bestow upon a person four new arms, on purpose that they might be tied up behind him? or, six new eyes, on purpose that they should be always shut? Is it credible?—But I must proceed to other arguments.

§. XIX. It is acknowledged by the more rational Christians, that this gift was not of a stable or permanent nature. Dr. *Middleton* says, that it was adapted to peculiar occasions, and withdrawn again as soon as it had served the particular purpose for which it was bestowed. That it did not constantly adhere to the apostles and first converts, but was communicated only by fits and starts, and

and on particular occasions, I will readily grant; but I must infer from this, that it was not the gift of *languages*. It is indeed very probable, that no person ever had a discretionary power, which always remained with him, to work miracles; and it is certain, I think, that the apostles could work them only occasionally, and when they were moved by some extraordinary impulse. But I affirm, that the supernatural knowledge of *languages* should be compared, not to the *cause*, but to the *effects* of miracles; and that it stands exactly in the same predicament, not with the *power* of *working* miracles, but with the *advantages* received from miracles *wrought*. Giving a new language to him who had but one, is precisely the same thing as giving a new leg to the maimed, who had but one. To bestow either was a miracle; but when the miracle was performed, when the new leg or the new language was received, the effects of it, and the advantages to be derived from it, were not temporary and occasional, but permanent and constant.

On my scheme this gift could not, in its very nature, but be occasional; because it meant only a certain degree of enthusiasm,
which

which no person could exercise or possess at will. It was the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost; that inspiration, while it lasted, would produce its proper effects; and when it ceased, those effects would cease of course.

§. XX. This inspiration is denoted by various phrases. It is called the *Holy Ghost*; the *gift of the Holy Ghost*; the *pouring out*, the *coming*, the *giving*, and the *receiying*, of the *Holy Ghost*. If I thought that my cause were not a very good one, or that it needed every support which I *could* give unto it, I would certainly avail myself of one or two of these phrases, and employ them in its service. But as this is not the case, I am not at all eager to catch at their assistance. There is, however, *another* phrase, which it would be wrong entirely to disregard. With an aspect more significant than the rest, marked with bolder features, and delivering its evidence in a more decisive tone, it demands to be heard. It is the *falling* of the Holy Ghost upon the speakers. *The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word, and they spake with tongues.* Acts x. 44—47. Let this Holy Ghost,

Ghost, this peculiar breath or wind, mean a cause, supernatural and metaphysical, or even merely physical and natural, it was certainly a cause too fine to be visible to mortal sight; and the most penetrating eye could not perceive the *manner* of its descent: the *manner* of its descent, however, is ascertained in the book of *Acts*, and more than once defined to be that of *falling*. The word implies *suddenness* and *violence*: but from whence could the idea be derived? It was suggested, most undoubtedly, by the effects. There was something in "the speaking with *tongues*" which led the mind to conceive of the descent of the agent under the idea of *falling*. And so there must have been, if the effect was speaking in *tones*. The violent agitations into which the speakers were thrown, and the peculiar inflections of voice with which they, on a *sudden*, spoke, would naturally suggest the notion of the Spirit's *falling* upon them. But if the effect were speaking languages, I see nothing in this which could possibly indicate such an idea respecting the *mode* of operation in the cause; as there was no reason *why* the speakers should begin to deliver an harangue, in
Greek,

Greek, more *abruptly* than they would in *Hebrew*; or why they should speak an inspired language with any other emotions than they did their native language. Account for it how you will, it is an incontrovertible fact, that though many gifts are ascribed to the Spirit, yet speaking in *tongues* is the only one which is ascribed to the Spirit's *falling* upon men; and that the "gift" of the *Holy Ghost*" means not the gift of *miracles* in general; but, determinately, the gift of *tongues*.

My hypothesis accounts for it very naturally and very easily. Though there were diversities of gifts, as *Paul* says, and all from the same spirit, yet there was this difference between speaking in tongues and the other gifts, that this consisted solely in the inclination or propensity to speak; whereas the others implied the communication, or the attainment, either of knowledge or power. They had no necessary connection with the holiness or piety of the person to whom they were communicated; and a man, for instance, might be devout in the extreme, and not possess the gifts of healings, or of the discernment of spirits. But the gift of speaking

speaking in tongues, was considered only as the necessary effect of an high degree of devotion; and it was therefore, with much propriety, called (exclusively) the gift of the Holy Ghost. A miraculous knowledge, or a miraculous power, were here out of the question; for here a miraculous utterance was the whole of the gift.

And it requires no uncommon penetration, to perceive from the accounts which the historian of the apostles, whether *Luke* or *Timothy*, gives of this gift, that it was exercised in consequence of sudden and unexpected impulses. The speakers were seized in an instant with some violent agitations, and changed in an instant the natural sound of their voice. On the day of Pentecost the rushing wind was heard, and the flaming tongues were seen, on a sudden; and the apostles as suddenly felt themselves moved to speak in tongues. At *Ephesus*, the twelve disciples for whom *Paul* prayed, spoke with tongues the very moment that he laid his hands upon them. And while *Peter* was yet preaching, the Holy Ghost fell on *Cornelius* and his family, and they spoke in tongues. Instantaneously, and in the midst of his sermon,

sermon, they interrupt him, and involuntarily put an end to it. The impulse was as sudden and as violent as it was irresistible: it was impossible not to ascribe such sudden effects to an operation as sudden in the cause, and to describe the manner of that operation, by calling it the *falling* of the Holy Ghost.

§. XXI. I discern also, I think, in *Simon of Samaria's* sin, a strong presumptive argument, that this gift was not the gift of languages. When *Simon* saw, that through laying on of the apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost, (that is, the gift of tongues) was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost; that is, speak with tongues: for universally to give or to receive the Holy Ghost, is to give or receive the gift of speaking with tongues. But *Peter* said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Acts viii. 18—20.

What

What was *Simon's* crime? Did he think that the apostles could confer this gift upon whom they pleased? or, did he think that, for a reward, they might be induced to confer it upon *him*? But where was the great crime of all this? Was it to be expected that a young convert should perfectly understand the philosophy of miracles, or infallibly know the apostles' hearts? Surely a man might be a *line* or two out in his *judgment*, and miss an hair's breadth of hitting the orthodoxy of either point, without being an execrable villain, or having a *heart not right in the sight of God*.

Simon, says the historian, (*Acts* viii. 11.) *had a long time bewitched the people of Samaria*; that is, as the verb signifies, in the original as well as in English, caused them to be *beside themselves*, and injured their understanding; and this he did by what the historian calls *magick*, and our translators *forcery*. The whole of this art consisted in knowing the secret virtues of different objects, and in applying them, unperceived, and without suspicion, to produce the intended effect. And *Simon* bewitched the *Samaritans* by means of causes which acted naturally and mechanically,

mechanically, and employed those powerful drugs and detested compositions which affect the brain. What wonder then that he should mistake the gift of *tongues*, for the effect of *forcery* and *magick*? For this, undoubtedly, was *Simon's* crime. He did not believe that it was the gift of God: he thought that it was a mere trick of human art; and "*Thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money,*" means, Thou hast thought that which is in reality the gift of God to be the effect of *forcery*; and consequently that the secret may be purchased with money. Hence the acrimony of *Peter's* reply. *Thy money perish with thee! I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. I know thy meaning and thy views. Thou thinkest that the gift of tongues is exactly in the line of thy former practices: thou hopest to become master of one secret more in the accursed trade of forcery; and thou offereest money for it, in the view only to make money of it again. Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. If this were the true nature of Simon's crime, it will follow*

low

low that the gift of *tongues* was not the gift of *languages*. *Simon*, no doubt, perverted his talents to the most abominable purposes; but talents he certainly had superior to his neighbours; and he could never imagine that the *knowledge of languages* was the effect of any combination of natural and mechanical causes, though he might imagine that such causes could produce some peculiar inflections in the *tones* of the voice. And what strengthens this argument is, that *Simon* does not covet to speak with *tongues* himself, which I think he would have done if they were *languages*; but only to possess the power or the secret of making *others* to speak with *tongues*. He does not wish to have the experiment tried upon himself, though he is so desirous of the power to try it upon others.

§. XXII. If we examine what the apostolical Christians *did* speak in *tongues*, we shall find that their subjects had a much nearer relation to *musical notes* than to *languages*.

They spoke in tongues the wonderful works of God. Acts ii. 11. And as the disciples were much in earnest, and deeply penetrated with their subject, it is rather more natural to

G

suppose

suppose that they spoke the high praises of God in some impassioned *tones*, than in foreign *languages*; and that far from the intolerable affectation of exhibiting themselves to him as *criticks* and *grammarians*, they meant only to express their veneration, gratitude, and hope. They might express their feelings in *musical sounds*, but they would hardly make use of any *language* besides their *own*. That was most natural to them, and as intelligible to God as any other.

They spoke with tongues, and magnified God. Acts x. 46. Impressed with a profound sense of the unrivaled grandeur of God, smitten with the charms of his infinite excellencies, and forming to themselves the greatest expectations from his love, they would magnify him in *musical notes*; but speaking various *languages* was nothing to the purpose.

They *prayed* to God in a *tongue*, and *blessed* him. *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth. When thou shalt bless with the spirit.* 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 16. In what disposition, must we imagine, did the first Christians address their homage to the Creator? Were it possible that they should be such unfeeling worshippers as to speak to him in a language
foreign

foreign and unnatural to them? or, is it not infinitely more probable that they spoke in certain *tones*, expressive of their sentiments, and the necessary consequence of what they felt?

Lastly; *They spoke with tongues, and prophesied.* Acts xix. 6. Even this *prophesying* has a greater analogy to *musick* than to *languages*, as is evident from the two following quotations. The first is in 1 Sam. x. 5, 6. *Thou shalt meet a company of prophets, says Samuel to Saul, coming down from the high place, with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, before them, and they shall prophesy; and the spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them.* The second is in 1 Chron. xxv. 1. *David separated to the service of the sons of Asaph, who should prophesy, with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals.* And *Peter*, on the day of Pentecost, represents the apostles speaking with *tongues* as an accomplishment of the prediction of *Joel*, who said, *Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.* Acts ii. 17.

§. XXIII. Mr. *Locke* says, that the word *prophesying* has three significations: predict-

ing future events, explaining scripture, and singing praises to God by the dictate of the Spirit. Were it certain that this last is the primary and proper meaning of the word in the New Testament, it would afford another proof, that speaking in *tongues* was speaking in *tones*, because it is very apparent that there was some very near connection between *prophefying* and speaking in *tongues*. That prophefying ever means explaining the books of the prophets, is, I think, more than can be proved; at least, not an instance can I recollect where it can possibly be supposed to have such a meaning. That it means predicting future events is certain; and it sometimes means telling what is past. *Prophefy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote thee: Matth. xxvi. 68.* But the first and principal meaning of the word seems to be to declaim in a poetick frenzy: and though it be used for revealing events, both past and future, yet it is used improperly, and only in a figurative sense. The primary idea is that of speaking by inspiration, and in an high degree of enthusiasm; and the prediction of future, or the post-diction of past events, was only an accidental circumstance. In
consequence

consequence of superior measures of inspiration, the prophet, no doubt, would often roll his piercing eye from the past and present to the future, and unfold to short-sighted mortals their destiny in days to come. But whether or no his imagination wrapt him into future time, if he declaimed by inspiration he was a prophet, and his declamation was a prophecy.

To confirm this idea, let me observe to you, that the prophets of old received all their revelations from God, by the organs of sense, by the ear, or by the eye. God never communicated knowledge immediately to their minds, but always by the use of means, either words or visions. These words and visions were sometimes real and sometimes imaginary; but in either case the prophet must possess a most vivid imagination; and he who possessed a strong and vivid imagination, would naturally be a prophet. What constituted the prophet was, the hearing of the words, or the seeing of the visions, and not the subject to which they referred. The words which his ear heard, and the figures which his eye saw, might relate to a hundred things besides the events of futurity;

but if he *heard* or *saw* them, he was, in the language of scripture, a prophet.

Let me observe to you also, that the *Jews* made use of musick, vocal and instrumental, to excite the prophetick spirit: you have a direct and full proof of this in the two texts quoted at the end of the last section. Now what could musick do? It could not enlighten the understanding, and communicate the knowledge of events to come. It could only give the proper tone to their imagination, and the proper warmth to their passions. The prophetick spirit then was not the spirit of foreknowledge in particular, but the spirit of a divine enthusiasm in general, and the gift of pronouncing an inspired song.

Let me observe to you further, that *Peter* as well as *Joel*, or rather God himself, for it is He who speaks, seems in *Joel* ii. 28, to consider prophesying as synonymous to dreaming dreams and seeing visions; phrases which do not suggest the idea of foretelling the secrets of futurity: and *Peter* says, that this prophecy was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost by the apostles speaking in tongues, though all that they spoke in tongues were the wonderful works of God. This was
dreaming

dreaming dreams, and seeing visions. This was *prophefying*. They predicted no events; and yet they prophesied: what they spoke they spoke by inspiration.

Let me observe to you lastly, that *Paul* calls the heathen poets *prophets*. *One of themselves, even a PROPHET of their own, said, The Cretans are always liars.* Tit. i. 12. He could not mean that this writer whom he cites was endowed with the knowledge of futurity, but only that he was in the general sense of the word *inspired*, and declaimed in verse.

But how erroneous soever my idea of the primary sense of *prophefying* may be, all acknowledge that it sometimes means singing by inspiration; and it was connected, intimately connected with speaking in tongues. This connection is most evident. *Peter* says, *This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; On my servants, and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophefy.* Acts ii. 18. The author of the book of *Acts* says, (xix. 6.) *That the Ephesian Christians spoke with tongues, and prophefied.* And *Paul* seldom mentions the one without the other. *Though I speak with*
the

the tongues of men and of angels; and though I have prophecy: 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2. Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease: 1 Cor. xiii. 8. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, (if indeed it was the gift of tongues) which was given thee, not by prophecy, as in our translation, but together with prophecy. 1 Tim. iv. 14. And throughout the fourteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, he speaks of both gifts, comparing the one with the other, giving directions concerning the exercise of each, and concluding with this advice, Covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.

Nor is it improbable that *prophesying*, at least in this connection, means singing the praise of God in an inspired hymn: in this sense of the word only can I perceive the full propriety of the following facts, observations, directions, and advices. *And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. Acts xxi. 9. The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. 1 Cor. xiv. 32. Every man praying or prophesying; every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth. 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5. Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith. Rom. xii. 6. Let the prophets*

prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. 1 Cor. xiv. 29. *Ye may all prophesy one by one.* 1 Cor. xiv. 31. *Despise not prophesying.* 1 Theff. v. 20. *Covet to prophesy.* 1 Cor. xiv. 39. Collect and examine the scattered evidence reflected from these different texts, and then tell me, if its united force will not be sufficient to prove, that, most probably, prophesying means singing praises to God in the feelings of devotion.

What absurdities must you suppose, by supposing that prophesying in these texts implies a miraculous knowledge of futurity. You must suppose that what the twelve apostles did in tongues, on the day of Pentecost, was predicting things to come; and that instead of speaking the feelings of a religious heart, or teaching the knowledge of Christianity, they only told the fortunes of their hearers. For *Peter* says, that they *prophesied*.—You must suppose that there were at least twelve disciples in the *Ephesian* church, who could read the book of fate, and who, as soon as *Paul* laid his hands upon them, immediately began to tell the destiny of others, though there were none present to hear it besides *Paul* himself.—You must

must suppose that *Paul* was endowed with this gift, for it should seem that he could *prophecy*; though the whole history of his life proves that he was as ignorant as others of what was to come either to himself or to them; and though the only thing which he foretold by a miracle was the safety of the ship's crew, which had been revealed to him in a dream.—You must suppose, that *Philip's* four daughters, all in one house, could tell people's fortunes, and yet that they did not know a syllable of *Paul's* fortune; for when he was at their house, he was informed of what would befall him at *Jerusalem*, whither he was then going, not by them, but by a certain stranger from *Judea*, who accidentally visited them while he was there.—You must suppose, that there was a distinct order of men in the *Corinthian* church, whose office it was to remove that mysterious veil which God in the constitution of nature has wisely thrown over future events, though we do not find that this college ever did any signal service to that church, or ever delivered a single oracle respecting the complexion of its fate.—You must suppose, that this oracular college foresaw and foretold what was to come,

come, by some immediate impulses from God, and yet that they were always at liberty, nay, that it was sometimes their duty, to suppress those impulses, to resist the solicitations of God, and to refuse to reveal to others what He had, for that purpose, revealed to them; for *Paul* says, *The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.*—You must suppose, that the prediction of future events constituted a part of the religious service in the *Corinthian* church, and that the business of the man, or of the woman, who *prophefied* in publick on the Lord's day, or when the Christians met, was to foretel the fortune of the week, or what should befall them until they met again.—You must suppose, that those who had a supernatural knowledge of futurity, had it by exprefs communication from that God who cannot lie, and who loves the truth; and yet that they were not to reveal and publish it, as they had received it from Him, but to modify, alter, or curtail it, as they or the church should think most adviseable, for they were to *prophefy according to the proportion or analogy of faith.*—You must suppose, that though the hearers were persuaded of the real inspiration of the prophet,

phet, though his predictions could contain in them no test by which they could examine whether they were true or false; and though no such examination could be necessary, as they would admit without hesitation the evidence of the God of knowledge, yet you must suppose, that these predictions were not to pass without a pretty strict examination; for *Paul* directs, *Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others JUDGE.*—You must suppose, that the miraculous gift of prescience was conferred for serious and important purposes; that when the distant scenes of futurity were to be brought forward to present view, it was to be done clearly and distinctly; and that the prediction was to be delivered in a manner the most likely to be heard and understood; and yet the people who prophesied in *Corinth* were permitted by the apostle to speak two or three at the same time. *Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge.* That he means two or three at once is most certain; because he says, that the whole congregation might *prophecy one by one.* These prophets spoke intelligibly, I grant, because they spoke in *chorus*; but this was not the natural way of delivering a didactic history

history of facts, whether past or future.—You must suppose, that all these different prophets had the revelation of the same events; that they all delivered them exactly in the same words, and that they spoke those words in the *same time*, otherwise they could not speak in concert, as certainly they did; for we find that the hearers understood what was said.—You must suppose, that, astonishing and useful as the gift of a supernatural foreknowledge was, yet there were some Christians who regarded it with contempt; else there could be no occasion for the advice, “*DESPISE not prophesyings.*”—And you must suppose, that miraculous as it was, it was attainable by all; for *Paul* says, *Covet to prophesy. I would that ye ALL spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: if ALL prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or is unlearned, he is convinced of all.* There surely needs no other argument to prove, that, in the language of *Paul* at least, *prophesying* means not foretelling things to come, but singing praises to God. But if it be probable that this is the meaning of *prophesying*, it is probable too, from this very circumstance, that speaking in *tongues* means speaking in
tones;

tones; and that the only difference betwixt them was, that the latter was speaking without words, or at least speaking them unintelligibly, and the former speaking so as to be understood.

§. XXIV. This difference there certainly was betwixt them. *He that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God; but he that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, exhortation, and comfort. He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth, edifieth the church: 1 Cor. xiv. 2--4. If I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you? except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine.*

Collecting the several parts of the antithesis, and reviewing the several features by which prophesying is distinguished from speaking with *tongues*, we learn at least what speaking with *tongues* is not. It is not to edify, to exhort, or to comfort. It is not to communicate any *revelation*, any *knowledge*, or any *doctrine*. It is not to *speak to men*; and have I not reason to add, it is not to *speak in languages*?

That

That prophesying was something intelligible is palpably evident, and it is as evident to me, that speaking in a *tongue* was in its very nature unintelligible. *He that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him.* The apostle does not say, He speaketh not unto *some* men, or *some* men do not understand him. He distinguishes the hearers indeed into two orders, those who understood the speaker, and those who understood him not. But in the first we find none but God, and in the last, all mankind, or man in the abstract. God alone, and not man, could understand him. Accordingly, we never read that these speakers ever conversed in their tongues one with another. They were ostentatious enough, *you* think, to speak them before those who did not understand them, and yet they never once spake them to those who did understand them. Not a sentence did they ever exchange in them among themselves; nay, the apostle supposes, that, if a man could speak in a tongue, he could receive no edification from *another's* speaking in it; for he says, *He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself*; that is, I suppose, *himself alone*.

But

But the word "*unknown*," you say, will make sense of this whole chapter, on the common interpretation. And what then? Because *tongues* may, by the addition of this epithet, render the chapter intelligible, on the supposition that they mean *languages*; must it be concluded that the word "*unknown*" ought to be added, or that *tongues* must signify *languages*? The word *stammering* or *stuttering*, understood before *tongues*, would necessarily determine that they mean, literally, the *member*; and in *this* meaning of them the whole chapter would be perfectly consistent with itself. Does it therefore follow, that *this* word ought to be added to the text, and that *tongues* here are to be literally understood? The word "*wooden*," before *tongues*, would be compatible enough with all that which is here said of them, and, if placed before them, would prove that they mean some *musical instruments*. But is this a sufficient reason to place that word before *tongues*, and to convince us that speaking in *tongues* meant speaking through some wooden tubes? Or, the word "*musical*," supplied, would make consistent sense of the whole chapter, and almost decide the question

tion in my favour? And yet you will scarcely give me leave to make the interpolation. I want it not indeed; for I affirm that the chapter is perfectly intelligible without the addition of any epithet before tongues.

Let us try, however, how this word "*unknown*" will sound before *tongues* in other texts. The apostles on the day of Pentecost *spoke with other tongues*. You will not grant, that the apostles spoke to their hearers in languages *unknown* to their hearers. The word then must not be supposed to be understood *here*. *Peter, and they who came with him, heard Cornelius and his family speak with tongues*. Acts x. 46. Is "*unknown*" to be understood *here*? But to *whom* will you say, that these tongues were *unknown*? To the speakers themselves, or to the hearers? But the only hearers were *Peter* and his fellow-travellers, who could all speak with *tongues themselves*; so that if *tongues* meant *languages*, they must be *unknown, not* to the hearers, but to the speakers. The twelve disciples whom *Paul* found at *Ephesus*, received from him the *Holy Ghost*, and immediately *spoke with tongues*. The word "*unknown*" has no business *here*; for these *tongues* must have been well-known

to *Paul*, on your scheme, who spoke with *tongues* more than all the *Corinthian* Christians; and you will not assert, that these twelve did not know *one another's* languages.

Tongues, and *speaking in tongues*, occur no less than *fourteen* times in this celebrated chapter; but the epithet "*unknown*" occurs not *once* before them in the original; nor yet *any where* else before them in all the New Testament; and even *here* it occurs, in our translation, but *six* times, out of the *fourteen* where *tongues* are mentioned. If it was needless to add it *eight* times out of the *fourteen*, the probability is, that it was needless to add it *at all*, and that these six texts wanted it no more than the rest.

That the rest make good sense without it, is, perhaps, indeed more than you will grant. But if it was supplied before *some* of them, it would make them speak absolute nonsense. *I would that ye all spake with tongues: 1 Cor. xiv. 5;* that is, you say, with *unknown* tongues. But the apostle could never wish that all the *Corinthian* church spoke *unknown languages*; for if *all* spoke them, in what sense could they be *unknown*? The very terms of the wish exclude the possibility

bility of introducing here this impertinent adjective. And in one passage where it is introduced, it serves only to perplex it, and to make it speak what, you yourself will own, the apostle could never mean. *If I pray in an UNKNOWN tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful; what is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.* 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15. If the apostle did not pray with his understanding when he prayed in an unknown language, he must mean, that the language in which he prayed was unknown, not to *others*, but to *himself*; for if he himself understood it, his understanding would pray in it, and not be unfruitful, whether others understood it or not. I conclude then, that the epithet "*unknown*" is, by our translators, used before tongues, against all reason and propriety; that the text never wants the addition of any epithet, and that, as prophesying was speaking something intelligible, so speaking in *tongues* was, in its very nature, speaking what was not to be understood.

§. XXV. Indeed there could be no foundation for any distinction at all between the two gifts, if speaking in a *tongue* meant speaking in a *language*. For let prophesying mean what you please, the man who spoke in a language in the church, must certainly speak something which was equivalent to prophesying. It is barely possible indeed, that he might stand up and deliver a discourse on the properties and uses of *Corinthian brass*, or he might pronounce at random, and in any order, without meaning and without connection, the words of his language, just as if a person was reading a column in a spelling dictionary: neither of which certainly could, in any sense, be called prophesying. But it is hardly credible, that a Christian orator, speaking publicly in a Christian church, would ever act so preposterous a part. And if he spoke upon any religious subject, there was no foundation for the distinction between prophesying and speaking in a *tongue*.

Let prophesying mean what you please, if it implied the use of words, the man who prophesied must speak in a *language*. What then, do you think, could the apostle mean
by

by instituting a comparison between the two gifts? What sense could there be in saying, *Greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh in a language?*

Considering the singularity of the opinion which I have adopted, and the universal prejudice in favour of that which I reject, I shall be censured neither for the multitude of my objections against the one, and of my arguments in support of the other; nor yet for urging these arguments and objections in *detail*, in order to demonstrate a fact which the bare mention of them, perhaps, would otherwise have sufficiently evinced. Upon this principle, I cannot help asking again, what foundation there was, or could be, for the distinction and comparison which *Paul* makes between these two gifts, if tongue means language. They are considered as two different gifts, and they were exercised by different persons. And yet how were they different? Speaking a prophecy *Paul* says, was speaking to *edification*; now if speaking in a language was not speaking a prophecy, speaking a prophecy at least was speaking in a language. But what propriety or sense would there be in such a

H 3

speech

speech as this? "On the last Lord's day, "and at a place of religious worship in "London, I heard two publick speakers address the congregation. One of them "spoke in a language, and the other spoke "to edification." Would not somebody immediately ask me, "Did not the first "speak to edification as well as the last? and "did not the last speak in a language as well "as the first? What can you mean by such "a distinction as this?" And what reply could I make to him? What explanation could I give him of my meaning? It is indeed past my comprehension, how such a speech could be capable of any meaning at all.

§. XXVI. In the *Corinthian* church, the people who spoke in *tongues* were an order of Christians, separate and distinct from others. That the same person might possess more than one spiritual gift, is very certain; but it is as certain, from the clearest evidence of plain and unequivocal texts, that there were in that church a class of believers, whose characteristic office it was to speak in *tongues*. *And God hath set some in the church, first apostles,*

apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. 1 Cor. xii. 28. Divines, prodigal of what was not their own, have generously supplied the *Corinthian* Christians with languages from heaven, in order to qualify them to preach Christianity among the distant heathens. Ill-fated generosity! Where do we meet with these gifted brethren? On the banks of the *Indus*, or on the coast of *Chili*? Civilizing the *American* savages, or disputing with the enlightened *Brachmins*? No. We meet with them all at home, in the *Corinthian* church. And *Paul* says that they were in their proper place: for he compares the various classes of believers which composed that church, to the various members of the natural body; and instead of advising them to commence philosophic vagabonds, or itinerant preachers, and to go and serve other nations, he only advises them to speak in tongues, so as to serve one another at *Corinth*. *When ye come together*, says he, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, *every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done to edifying.*

A separate

A separate and a numerous order of Christians in the *Corinthian* church to speak foreign languages to their *Corinthian* brethren!

§. XXVII. Besides, speaking in *tongues* was one of the lowest offices in the church. In 1 Cor. xii. *Paul* thrice enumerates the different gifts of the Spirit, or the different classes and offices of Christians; he enumerates them each time in the same succession, and each time he places the gift of *tongues*, or those who spoke with *tongues*, in the same division on the scale. It is, except one, the last, the lowest, and the least. One of these passages indeed speaks sufficiently for itself, and leaves not the shadow of a doubt, but that the apostle intended to mention those spiritual gifts, in the order of their value. *And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.* 1 Cor. xii. 28: The adverbs of number and succession, which he prefixes to the first five superior offices, and which he discontinues afterwards, only because the reader would of course continue them in his mind, and prefix them

them to the remaining offices, prove, beyond a contradiction, that the latter are inferior to the former, and the last of all inferior to all the rest.

The apostle himself in another place compares the gift of *tongues* with that of *prophecy*, and in exprefs words gives a decided preference to the latter. *I would*, says he, 1 Cor. xiv. 5, *that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret that the church may receive edifying.* Accordingly his advice to the *Corinthians* is, *Covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.* 1 Cor. xiv. 39.

Far be it from me, to pretend to adjust the respective merits of extraordinary gifts, or to ascertain the precise and comparative value of that of *tongues*; but I cannot help observing, that *Paul* assigns to this, in the scale of excellence, a rank far inferior than that which the inspired knowledge of languages would have been entitled to. If speaking with *tongues* was speaking inspired languages, no man could conclude as *Paul* does, that it was less valuable, less useful, and less honourable, than *prophecy*. For,
explain

explain this prophesying in what sense you please, say that it was to foretel events, to expound the Old Testament, or to chaunt an inspired hymn to the glory of God; yet the man who did this only in his *native* language, could not be greater than him who could do all this in *several* languages. The man who understands *several* languages, all other circumstances being supposed the same, must be deemed greater than the man who understands but *one*. And yet *Paul* says, *Greater is he that prophecieth than he that speaketh with tongues*. If this decision is founded in truth and justice, *tongues* does not mean *languages*, but most probably some kind of *tunes*. And the professed speakers in tongues, were NOT *the apostles*, NOT *the prophets*, NOT *the teachers*, NOT *those who could work miracles*, NOT *those who had the gifts of healings*, NOT *those who had authority or office in the church under the titles of belps and governments*, but a different class; and in the estimation of *Paul*, one of the least respectable amongst the whole body of Christians.

§. XXVIII. *Tongues*, says the apostle, 1 Cor. xiv. 22, *are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not.* They were conferred, as I affirm, for the sake only of those who spoke in them, and for the immediate advantage of the possessors alone. But in the use of them it must unavoidably happen, that the speakers would soon be noticed by others; they would be frequently heard by their believing brethren, and if not heard, yet heard of, by those who were unbelievers. Now these *tongues*, whatever they may signify, *Paul* asserts are for a *sign, not to believers, but only to the unbelievers.*

What is a *sign*? The word is used sometimes for a common mark or signal of a natural phenomenon; sometimes for a mark or signal of the divine power and presence; and sometimes, I imagine, for wonders or extraordinary appearances in general, without regarding them as proper references to any thing else. You have not yet adopted the maxim, *That man's great reason is God's great enemy*; and you will not maintain that the unbelievers could see, or hear, or understand, better than the believers: and yet this you must maintain, or acknowledge, that speaking

speaking *languages*, be they what languages you choose to name, could not in the nature of things be a sign, let sign mean what it will, to unbelievers *more* than to believers.

On the contrary, languages, it is obvious, would be more a sign, in every sense of the word, to the Christians than to the infidels; because the Christians would be infinitely more sure than the infidels could be, that these languages were not acquired by human industry, but were an immediate communication from God; and a sensible proof of his power and presence with those who spoke them.

But on my hypothesis there is here no difficulty at all. The apostle is not determining the use or the final causes of tongues, he is only describing the actual effects which they had, in fact, at that time, upon the *Corinthian* infidels; and his words may be thus paraphrased: "The judgment which
 "unbelievers form, and will yet form, of
 "speaking in tongues, should be a strong
 "motive to you to guard against all abuses
 "of this gift. The practice of speaking in
 "tones indeed is *now* become so general
 "amongst

“ amongst *you believers*, that it does not ex-
 “ cite in you the least surprise: you regard
 “ it with indifference; and you are not sensi-
 “ ble of the improprieties of those who fol-
 “ low it. But you should consider, that the
 “ case is very different with *unbelievers*. If
 “ *tones* are no longer a wonder to *you*, they
 “ are to *them* a wonder yet. They are still
 “ new and strange to *them*; objects of at-
 “ tention, curiosity, and remark. The un-
 “ believers regard them *still* with surprise;
 “ but if you will use no discretion in the
 “ use of them, their surprise will soon turn
 “ into contempt, and they will naturally say
 “ *that you are mad.*”

§. XXIX. At the time when *Paul* wrote
 to the *Corinthians* his second Epistle, *tongues*
 were for a *sign* to the *unbelievers*, but they
 were *totally* useless to the *believers*. They
 had, from their frequency, ceased to be even
 a sign to *them*; and they could be *nothing* else
 to *any* one, except to the possessor himself.

The gift of *tongues* was of no service to
 the believing brethren. *He that speaketh in a*
tongue, says *Paul*, *speaketh not unto men, but*
unto God, for no man understandeth him; but he
that

that prophesieth, speaketh unto men, to edification, and exhortation, and comfort. He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth, edifieth the church. 1 Cor. xiv. 1—4.

Speaking in a *tongue*, it is evident, was not speaking to the church or to men. Could it then be speaking a new language by inspiration? What a pity, that the speaker could not manage his high-born dialect a little better than this, and say something in it edifying, or at least intelligible! And what a strange and peculiar property those inspired languages had! It was impossible to convey in them to others, either edification, exhortation, or comfort; and the plainest sense in the world, delivered in one of these languages, instantly became unintelligible to every hearer. Substitute *tones* in the place of *languages*, and the whole mystery is at once revealed. *They* could be profitable to no person besides the speaker, and in the mere state of *tones*, could contribute nothing to the edification of others.

§. XXX. The proper use of language certainly is to be the interpreter of our thoughts; but speaking in *tongues*, so far
from

from interpreting any thing, stood in need itself of an interpretation. You are astonished at this representation of the gift! *Paul!* Stand forth and justify an idea, which on thine authority I have ventured to adopt. *Greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying.* 1 Cor. xiv. 5. *Let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret.* 1 Cor. xiv. 14. *If any man speak in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and let one interpret.* 1 Cor. xiv. 27. *But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself and to God.* 1 Cor. xiv. 28. No wonder that this speaking was utterly unprofitable to the hearers; for what was spoke in *tongues* conveyed no ideas to the mind, unless it was explained.

Another proof, if another *now* can be necessary, that the communication of this gift was not a qualification for the instruction of heathens in their own language. How can you suppose, that Providence should enable man, by a miracle, to speak in *one* language, what no person could understand, unless it was translated into *another*!

Why

Why was it not as well to speak in this *other* language at first, and leave the inspired language alone. However Providence may love to use means, it would hardly go out of its way to employ those which can contribute nothing to accomplish the desired end, and which must be at last removed and set aside before that end can be accomplished.

With respect to this business of interpreting, *Paul* has supposed four cases. He supposes, that the speaker might be able to interpret his own tongue, or that another might be able to interpret it for him; and he supposes too, that neither of them might be able to interpret it. The three first accord with your scheme as perfectly as they do with mine; but you will find the fourth very untractable indeed.

The man himself might be able to interpret his own tongue, or another might be able to interpret for him; *you* say, by translating what he had spoken into the hearer's language; and, *I* say, by explaining unto them what devout passions he had experienced. It might easily happen, however, that no other person could interpret for the speaker; *you* say, Because there might be no
other

other present who understood his language; and, *I* say, Because it must have been often impossible for him to tell what emotions the speaker had felt.

§. XXXI. But *Paul* supposes also, that the *speaker* himself might be unable to interpret his *own* tongue. And on my scheme, this is as it should be. For speaking from strong impressions, in certain *tones*, either with or without words, it was not always possible for him to tell afterwards what devout frames he had experienced.

Unsatisfactory as this account of the matter may be, can you, on the common scheme, give one which is not much more so. What cause can *you* assign why he should not be able to interpret his *language*? or what room could there be for the apostle to say, *Let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret.* 1 Cor. xiv. 13. *If there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church.* 1 Cor. xiv. 28.

The native language of the *Corinthians* was *Greek*. But a *Corinthian* Christian stands up in the *Corinthian* church and speaks *Latin*. I will not ask for what purpose a private
I Christian

Christian in a *Grecian* church was inspired with the knowledge of the *Roman* language. I will not ask, what should induce him to *speak* it, if he *understood* it. I will not ask, what should impel him to speak it in the *church*. I will only ask, why he could not translate his *Latin* into *Greek*? He could talk excellent sense for half an hour, with ease and fluency, in good *Latin*, a language which none of the congregation understood, and when he had done, he could not tell his countrymen, in his native language, which they did understand, one single sentence of what he had been saying!

§. XXXII. It hangs heavy also on your scheme, that there should be, in the *Corinthian* church, Christians whose business it was to *interpret tongues*. To another, *divers kinds of tongues*; to another, *interpretation of tongues*. 1 Cor. xii. 10. *Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?* 1 Cor. xii. 30. *If there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church.* 1 Cor. xiv. 28.

Speaking in tongues, and *interpreting* them, were two different gifts, and belonged to two different classes of men. As the *speaker*
in

in a tongue could not always *interpret*, so the professed *interpreter* could never *speak* in a tongue: and yet this interpreter must understand as many languages as the speaker, else he could not translate them. Why then could he not *speak* them?

Little disposed as I am to produce an argument, *a priori*, against a problematical fact, and little acquainted as I am with the ultimate views of nature in any of its operations, I cannot avoid remarking, that, on your scheme, *here* is a *miraculous* language communicated to *two* persons, without any final cause, discoverable at least by us. The *Corinthian* church is assembled together, and understands no language besides *Greek*. But two persons, inspired with the knowledge of *Latin*, stand up, the one to speak it, and the other to translate it into *Greek*. Now suppose that *neither* of them understood *Latin*, and that the *first* had spoken at once in *Greek*, in what respect would the congregation have been less edified? I had always thought, that Providence wrought miracles in order to attain its ends in a more compendious way than by following the beaten track of nature. But communicating *Latin*

to *two* persons in a *Grecian* society, in order that *one* of them might at *last* speak to it, in *Greek*, was not saving either time or causes, and far from shortening the road, seems to me to be going further round than usual.

Speaking in tones, and *interpreting* them, were, in the very nature of things, separate and distinct. Mere tones could explain nothing; and to render them in any degree useful to the community, it was necessary to *give* them a meaning, and to translate them into language. You may wonder, perhaps, how any one could interpret what was spoken in sounds to which art had given no signification. But you will recollect that the limits of "possibility" are very extensive. After three minutes' consideration we are apt to say, that a thing is impossible, because we have not been able in that short time to think of any means to effect it; whereas after three days' consideration, it would in theory appear very possible, and after three months' trial, very easy in practice.—You will recollect also, that every passion, whether hope or fear, joy or sorrow, triumph or terror, is expressed in a tone of voice which is peculiar to that passion, and which, as it
is

is the language of nature, is easily understood by the most ignorant.—You will recollect further, that my idea of speaking in tongues does not exclude any extraordinary assistances from God, either in the speaking or in the interpreting of them.—And you will recollect lastly, that I may be mistaken in my notion of interpreting them; but if I am, that mistake does not weaken the argument of this section; which is founded only on the reality of a *difference* between these two gifts. Let the deciphering of tongues mean what you will, the person who spoke them must, if they were languages, be able to decipher, interpret, or translate them.

§. XXXIII. Nor is the manner in which *tongues* were abused, a weak proof that they were not *languages*. *Paul* considers it as some abuse of them to speak them *at all* in the church. It is true, he says, *forbid not to speak with tongues*, 1 Cor. xiv. 39; but it is as true, that he could have wished their utter silence. *He that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him.* 1 Cor. xiv. 1. *I speak with tongues more than you all; yet in the church*

I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than five thousand words in a tongue. 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19. If however, says he, a man will speak in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course. 1 Cor. xiv. 27. Can any one conclude from these expressions, that Paul wished the Corinthians to continue to speak with tongues in the church? And yet if tongues meant languages, what place more proper than the church to speak them in?

It was a still greater abuse of them, to speak them in the church when nobody was present who could interpret them. *If any man speak in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course, and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself and to God. 1 Cor. xiv. 27, 28. But the speaker could have no motive to speak an inspired language to his countrymen, who all understood his native language. The words of our own native language, as a French writer observes, always makes a greater impression upon us, than those of a foreign one. Words indeed, in any language, are but arbitrary signs for ideas: but*
from

from the affociations of our infant years, the connection between our ideas and the words of our *own* language is so well imprinted on the mind, that *these* words seem to us to have some natural energy or propriety in them, to express our ideas. Having seized, as it were, the first place in our memory, they will always affect us more than the words of any other language attained in succeeding years. The effect which words produce, depends on the mechanical spring of our organs, and consequently on the facility and promptitude of their movements. If our imagination has not been early accustomed to represent to us *readily* certain ideas, on the hearing of certain sounds, these sounds or words make a much weaker and slower impression upon us, than that which is produced by those words to which our organs have been habituated from our infancy. The first Christians then would naturally always speak in their native language, to all those who could understand them in it.

It was another abuse of tongues, that they were suffered to engross the whole, or at least a disproportionable part of the publick service. *If the whole church be come together*
into

into one place, and all speak with tongues, 1 Cor. xiv. 23; that is, if speaking with *tongues* be made the *whole* of the service, or if *they only* speak who speak in *tongues*. Whether the apostle is describing a fact, or making a supposition, it may be inferred from his words, that *tongues* consumed *too much* of the time devoted, in the *Corinthian* church, to the publick offices of religion. *How is it then, brethren*, says he, *when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done to edifying*, 1 Cor. xiv. 26; that is, seeing different persons among you have different talents to exercise in your religious assemblies, let there be a proper time allowed for the exercise of each, and let not those who speak in tongues, engross the whole time to themselves. But in what sense could speaking in a *language* take up too much of the congregation's time; or, if tongue means language, what could *Paul* mean by the direction, *If any man speak in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three?* 1 Cor. xiv. 27.—He adds, "*and that by course.*" This clause, perhaps, only indicates that the *same* two or three should not speak *always*,
but

but one set on this Lord's day, and another on the following, without determining whether they were to speak in succession, or all at once. But it is generally understood to mean, that they were to speak in succession, and to imply that they *had* spoken in tongues *all* at the *same time*. The *Corinthian* Christians might abuse an inspired language, if they had it, and could use it at discretion; but they would abuse it in the same manner as they would their native or an acquired one. They might employ it to all the vain or bad purposes to which language is employed; but to speak it, *all*, at the *same time*, was such an abuse of it, as was not in human nature to commit. These geniuses perhaps imagined, that as they had received their languages in a new way, they must invent a new way to abuse them!

§. XXXIV. That *tongues* are compared to the sounds of certain *musical instruments* is Mr. *Byrom's* own observation, to prove that they were not languages; and I wish, that the argument to be deduced from it, was also his. But unhappily, *that* like the rest must be *mine*, and I must manage it as well
as

as I can. Tongues are compared to the sounds of *brass*, of a *cymbal*, of a *pipe*, of an *harp*, and of a *trumpet*.

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels; that is, though I utter every possible sound in nature, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. 1 Cor. xiii. 1. The speaker in tongues, on your hypothesis, indeed, if he had not charity, might be compared to any insignificant instrument; but the propriety of the comparison here made, is best preserved on Mr. Byrom's, as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals have a much nearer resemblance to persons who utter some *musical sounds*, whether with or without words, than to those who talk *several languages*.

And even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? 1 Cor. xiv. 7. What can be a more natural conclusion from these words, than that there was no distinction in the sounds, voice, or words, of those who spoke in *tongues*; and that they either pronounced no words at all, or pronounced them in such a manner as not to be understood.

If

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound—a new or a strange sound, which men have not agreed to use as a signal—who shall prepare himself for the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken, for ye shall speak into the air. 1 Cor. xiv. 8, 9. Words easy to be understood, our translators say; but the original is λογον ευσεμον, and should have been translated, significant words, or words which have a meaning. The Corinthians uttered obscure and uncertain sounds, which men had never appropriated to express any ideas. They spoke no significant words! They spoke into the air! Their tongues were nothing but tones. There are, it may be, so many kinds, or genera, of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. There may be a meaning, or there may be a meaning fixed, to every tone or sound in nature. But if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. 1 Cor. xiv. 10, 11. Do these allusions and comparisons suggest the idea of languages? or are sounds and voices the proper terms for significant words? I think not.

§. XXXV. Speaking in *tongues* bore some resemblance to drunkenness. I infer this from the suspicion which some entertained of the apostles' sobriety on the day of Pentecost. *They were all filled*, says the *historian*, *with the Holy Ghost*; but some *scoffers* said, *That they were full of new wine*. However palpably false and absurd the accusation was, there must have been some kind of foundation for it, in the *manner* of their speaking. It was ungenerous! it was unjust, but it had some semblance to truth and probability. The scoffers accounted for the phenomenon according to their humour and inclination. They ascribed it to drunkenness, but they were so far honest and sincere, and spoke as they thought. It was possible then for ignorance and prejudice, at first view, to perceive some faint resemblance between ebriety and speaking in tongues. They have been in fact mistaken, for a moment, the one for the other.

And I infer it also from a passage in the Epistle to the *Epheſians*, v. 18, 19. *Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, making melody*
in

in your heart to the Lord. Be not filled with wine, but be filled with the Spirit. By what association of ideas did the apostle connect together this prohibition and this advice? How came the first idea to suggest or introduce the second? What was it that rendered the transition natural from the one to the other? *Wine* and the *Holy Ghost*, so far from having any likeness to each other as causes, are incapable even of being compared together. But they produced effects not altogether unlike.

Speaking in *tongues* indeed is not in so many words mentioned here; but the very essence of it is described, both in its cause and in its effects, as well as in the sentiments which ignorance would form of it. *Be filled with the spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, making melody in your heart to the Lord. Be not drunk with wine.*

§. XXXVI. If some imagined that it resembled *drunkenness*, others imagined that it resembled *madness*. *If the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are un-*
learned,

learned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? 1 Cor. xiv. 23. If they spoke good sense in languages which they had never learnt, the man who should say that they were mad, must have been mad himself. Who would say so? The unlearned, you reply, and the unbelievers; but did not those who, in *your* opinion, spoke different languages, speak also in the language of these *unlearned* people? What! Did they speak on purpose not to be understood? Because they could speak other languages, did they disdain to speak the language of the vulgar? or would not the unbelievers believe their own ears? Besides, *Paul*, by the word *idiots*, or *unlearned*, does not mean unlearned in the languages, but simple and ignorant people in general, who were unaccustomed to think, or meditate; who were unacquainted with the nature and causes of things; and who consequently would judge, according to appearances, of those who spoke in tongues, and, without farther enquiry, conclude that they were mad.

You may say, perhaps, that the suspicion of madness would arise not from their speaking in *tongues*, but from their speaking *all together*.

together. It is, however, utterly un-
 conceivable to me, that *languages*, in the nature
 of things, would be thus abused, but by
 those who were madmen in reality. Accused
 of madness some of the first Christians cer-
 tainly were; and amongst the rest *St. Paul*.
 I think that the accusation was founded on
 his speaking with *tongues*; and I think so
 from his defence of himself. *Whether we be*
besides ourselves, it is to God, or whether we be
sober, it is for your cause. 2 Cor. v. 13. *Whe-*
ther we be besides ourselves, it is to God. When
 I feel my heart animated and filled as with
 the present GOD, and express those feelings
 in fervent and impassioned tones, you say
 that I am mad. But those tones and feelings
 are for the glory of GOD. They declare his
 power; and are a proof of the conviction of
 his truth. *Or whether we be sober, it is for*
your cause. When I speak in the usual man-
 ner, it is then for your profit and edification.

§. XXXVII. I appeal to plain, literal,
 and express texts, for the falsehood of the
 common opinion, and for the truth of Mr.
Byrom's and mine. *If I pray in a tongue, my*
spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful.

1 Cor.

1 Cor. xiv. 14. Unfruitful to whom? to others, or to himself? Most undoubtedly to himself. The apostle is mentioning the advantages which he himself derived from praying in a *tongue*. His *spirit*, or his heart received some benefit from it, but his *understanding* none, *that* remained fruitless, or as the word may be literally rendered, *without* fruit. *What is it then, I will pray with the spirit, I will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also.* 1 Cor. xiv. 15. Praying and singing in a *tongue*, was not praying and singing with the *understanding*. What then could it be but praying and singing in *tones*, or *inarticulate sounds* which had no meaning. *I thank my God, says he, I speak with more tongues than you all, yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.* 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

§. XXXVIII. Speaking in *tones* was a natural and almost a necessary consequence of the truth of Christianity. All strong passions express themselves in tones. For the truth of this I might appeal to every inferior

inferior animal which can utter vocal sounds, and to every human being upon the face of the earth: all mankind, in all their different degrees of refinement, from the savage *Indian*, who sings his war-song in the notes of untutored nature, to the most consummate orator of *Rome* or *Athens*, who delivered his declamations in *notes* according to the correctest rules of art, all universally attest the truth of this fact. Its truth, indeed, is known to every one; for every one's own observation and experience must have supplied him with a thousand proofs of it, and we all know that every passion has a tone and accent peculiar to itself.

If any single passion, excited by the common objects of the world, not raised to the highest pitch, and continuing but for a short time, naturally and necessarily throws the voice into certain *tones*, what wonder is it that religious passions should, in a superior degree, produce as naturally and as necessarily the same effect?

There are seasons in every man's life when the objects of religion affect him much, and communicate to his passions a considerable degree of force and elevation; but their in-

K

fluence

fluence will be of course stronger on the virtuous and devout mind. Though a man's devotion be no proof of his sense, (unless by sense be meant prudence) yet it is always a proof of his sensibility. His ideas may not be clearer, or his understanding more comprehensive, than those of the undevout; but his heart must possess finer feelings, or, in other words, a warmer imagination. And what may not imagination suppose? Rising on the lofty wings of genius and devotion, and traversing at will the unbounded region of possibility, it can combine its old ideas in a thousand ways, connect together things never connected in nature, and produce almost any effects on the organs of the body.

And, to kindle their imagination, the apostles had the evidence and impressions of sense. They lived at the very time *when*, and on the very spot *where*, two of the most astonishing miracles were performed, and on which depends the truth of Christianity; I mean, the resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus. In the fifty days which intervened between his crucifixion and the day of Pentecost, what new and singular objects were presented to their eyes!—a crucified, a risen, and

and an ascending Saviour. What new and grand ideas were presented to their minds, while he spoke to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God! And what new and tumultuous passions of different kinds must have agitated their hearts at what they saw and heard! When they considered the great power of God in raising a breathless and a mangled corps from the fetters of death to a new and immortal life;—when they considered the ascension of their Lord on a cloud, as in a triumphal chariot, from earth to heaven, and the distinguished honours to which he was there advanced for the suffering of death;—when they considered the arduous commission which he had delegated to them of proselyting the world to him, and the promised power from on high to assist them in the execution of it;—when they considered the indissoluble friendship which he, though exalted, would still have for them, and which but strengthened and increased, as his power increased to serve them;—when they considered the difficulties and the dangers which they were likely to meet with, in the attempt to teach wisdom to fools, or virtue to the wicked;—when

they considered the singularity of the cause in which they were engaged, and the smallness of their number, compared with the associations of different kinds which would be formed against them; and on the other hand, the importance of their principles to the general happiness of the world, the prospect of making profelytes, who would unite with them in the same interest, and the innumerable multitudes, which, in the dim spaces of futurity, they saw, rising to defend their name and to call them blessed;—and above all, when they considered the certainty of being one day reunited to their absent Lord, beyond these perishable skies, in the mansions which he was gone to prepare for them in his Father's house.—When they thought of these things, imagine, if you can, what their feelings were. Extraordinary feelings will express themselves in an extraordinary manner; and those which the apostles felt would naturally and necessarily affect the whole muscular frame, the organs of speech, the tone of pronunciation, and the sound and qualities of the voice.

During fifty days they have employed their thoughts, without intermission, on these most interesting

interesting subjects. During fifty days they have entirely secluded themselves from the world and its concerns. During fifty days they have not been able to eat that daily bread, which is necessary to preserve the body in vigour and spirits. During fifty days they have not been able to take that refreshment in sleep, which wearied nature so much requires, but which, alas! it frequently seeks in vain. In this sad and solemn situation they meet early on the day of Pentecost. Perhaps they have sat up together all the preceding night. *They are all together, in one place, with one accord.* Perhaps they talk of the promised power from on high. One enquires what the promise meant; another wonders that it has not been before now accomplished; a third suggests, that it may be accomplished at this time; and a fourth prognosticates, that they must wait yet longer for it. Distracted between hope and fear, disappointment and expectation, they know not what to say—they know not what to think.

In this ominous and awful moment of silence and suspense, *suddenly there comes a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind,*

and it fills all the house where they are sitting, and there appear unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sits upon each of them. Who can describe the feelings of this instant, or the passions which they inspire? Such passions as were never felt before since the world began! Such passions as will be never felt again while the world endures! Was *this* a time for cool reflection, or for a punctilious observance of form and ceremony? O no! Now enthusiasm was reason; and the most extravagant agitations, strict propriety and decorum. Filled with sentiments too new, too great, too powerful, to be spoken in the feeble words of art, the apostles spoke them in the expressive tones of nature. Their tones were languages. Their tones were eloquence.

On my scheme, *speaking with tongues* was strictly connected with the truth of Christianity; not by a miracle perhaps, but in the nature of things, and by that powerful and universal bond which connects a cause with its effect. It was what ought to have happened, what must have happened. The feelings of the apostles corresponded with those scenes to which they said that they had
been

been witnesses. They were the feelings which would necessarily take place if those scenes were such as represented.

Had they declared that they had seen Jesus ascending into heaven, after they had conversed with him forty days since his resurrection, and at the same time appeared to feel none of those deep impressions which such events must be supposed to make upon the human mind, where would have been the probability of their tale? They might have talked *Greek* and *Latin* to us with all the eloquence of *Demosthenes* and *Cicero*; but what would have been the effect? At a scene so singular, indeed, we might be filled with wonder; but from a scene so unnatural we should turn away with disgust. We might wonder how they came to be such scholars and orators all at once; but we should wonder much more at the insensibility of persons, so peculiarly circumstanced as they were, who could think of shewing at *such* a time their skill in oratory and languages. Preceding circumstances, if true, would have led us to expect something very different from this. Speaking *languages* at *such* a time! It was out of season, out of character,

character, out of nature. If they *could* speak languages by a miracle, they could never find it in their hearts to speak them *now*. But their character was consistent, and their conduct natural. They spoke in *tones*. If Christianity be true, it is almost necessary to suppose that the apostles spoke in tones.

§. XXXIX. And they could not have spoken in this manner if Christianity be false; because, if Jesus had not risen and ascended, they could not have felt those impressions and that enthusiasm which this mode of speaking necessarily presupposes.

If they came by night and stole away his body, they knew that he was not risen, and that he was not the Messiah. They could have no expectations from Christ; and the very attempt to support the credit of a person, as the Messiah, who, they *knew*, was *not* the Messiah, must exclude all expectations from God. There was no room for enthusiasm here.

Let us suppose then, that they never saw him since he died, but that they were only *informed* that he was risen and ascended; and that instead of intending to deceive others,
somebody

somebody or other deceived them. They might believe the tale; but it told a fact which had no immediate reference to *them*. Jesus *now* was no more to them than if he had been still in the grave; he was gone to heaven, and there was an end of the matter. Considered only as a fact, there was nothing in *his* ascension, more than in the ascension of *Elijah*, to attach *them* to support his *cause*; indeed he had, on this supposition, no cause to be supported; for if they never saw him since he was risen, he never explained to them the *scriptures concerning himself*; he never told them, *All power is given unto me in heaven and earth*; he never said unto them, *Go, and preach the Gospel to every creature: tarry at Jerusalem till ye be endowed with power from on high: I am with you to the end of the world*: that is, they could never be enthusiasts.

Perhaps, some impostor personated him, and persuaded them that *he* was *Jesus* risen from the dead. And he might impose himself upon one or two, or all of them, for half an hour in the dusk of the evening; but how long would the imposture last? For fifty days? No, nor yet for fifty hours. In order to succeed, the impostor had to personate,

personate, not only the form, the face, the features, and the voice of Jesus; but his knowledge and power, the prints of the nails in his hands and feet, and his ascension into heaven. The cheat must have been discovered, almost the very moment it was attempted, and the discovery would not fill the apostles with enthusiasm.

Who can tell; might they not see his *apparition*, tho' he was not really risen? But if it did *not* speak to them, they were nothing the wiser for it, only it was a proof to them that Jesus was not the true Messiah, because he was still dead; and if it *did* speak to them, and told the truth, it said nothing to kindle their enthusiasm; for surely it never told them, that it was real flesh and bones, that it was the body of *Jesus*, and that they must go and make the world believe it.

One supposition yet remains. The apostles were capable of imagining and believing any thing. Their disturbed brains rendered them incapable of distinguishing between truth and falsehood. Consider what this supposition amounts to. It is, not only that they reasoned weakly, and thought perversely, or were a little whimsical in their minds and
subject

subject to hypochondriacal affections; it is, that they mistook dreams for realities, objects of fancy for objects of sense, and the illusions of their own brains for truth and facts; it is, that they were bedlamites and madmen.

One madman might imagine all those events which are said to have taken place between the crucifixion of Jesus, and the day of Pentecost, and mistake that imagination for an history of real facts; many a madman has imagined stranger things. But that *twelve* madmen should for *fifty* days all imagine the *same things* and in the *same succession*, and yet that those things had no existence in nature, is less than possible without a miracle. If the Apostles were absolutely insane, they could never agree about the resurrection, appearances, or ascension of Jesus. They could never, all, entertain the same idea, of a promise having been made to them, and to be soon accomplished. They could never meet without quarrels and murder, and would never be suffered to walk the streets of Jerusalem. It is impossible to account for their being *together in one place, with one accord, and speaking in tones*, but on the supposition that Christianity is true.

And

And so it is, you say, if they spoke in *languages*. I deny it. If languages are meant, the utmost you can infer from the history is, that the apostles spoke a few and unconnected words in several on the day of Pentecost. What different, what contrary ideas the audience entertained of what they heard! Some thought the Apostles spoke in these languages, because they were *praising* God; others affirmed that they spoke in them because they were *drunk*. This difference of opinion among the hearers, is a demonstration that they heard nothing of which they could make any sense, and that if they heard different languages, they could hear only a *few* words *now* and *then*. And surely there might be some amongst the hundred and twenty, or even amongst the twelve, who could speak a few words in more languages than one. So that *languages* seem not to have the connection which *tones* have, with the truth of Christianity.

§. XL. Perfectly consonant to my account of tongues is the reason which *Paul* gives, why a time would come when they should cease. It is because they were a *child-*
ish

ish thing. Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away. 1 Cor. xiii.

8. What period does the apostle refer to? Where or when shall these tongues *cease*? In heaven, or at the resurrection? I have *some* doubt whether or no *Paul* believed that there would be *no tongues* in heaven, as he expressly speaks of the *tongues* of *Angels* at the beginning of this same chapter.—I have *some* doubt whether or no he would have used the word *cease* to denote the *absence* of tongues there, as it seems an impropriety to say, that a thing shall *cease* in a place, where it never *existed*.—I have my *doubts* also whether he would have said, that *knowledge* should *vanish away* in heaven. If he meant *real* knowledge, the assertion is not *true*. If he meant *false* knowledge, it is *frivolous*. But I have *no doubt* at all, that the *charity* which he describes *will also fail* in heaven. Read his description of it, which of those properties that he mentions can be exercised in *heaven*? How can such charity as this have any existence there. In its *principle*, you reply, it may—the great principle of benevolence,

lence, which *would* display all these virtues, and manifest all these properties, if in such a state there was any *occasion* for them. Of the apostle's metaphysics I know nothing, nor can tell what idea he had of a *principle existing*, at a time when *all its properties* shall have *ceased* to exist. But if this were his meaning, he might as well have said, that *tongues* and *prophecys* would *never fail*, because *they* too will exist in heaven, in their *principle*; that is, they would be *exercised* there if there were any *opportunity* or *occasion* for it.

But he himself sufficiently informs us, what period it is to which he alludes, by calling it *that which is perfect*. *We know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.* 1 Cor. xiii. 10. By the word *perfect*, he always means *years of maturity*; and the *perfection* of which he speaks, takes place in the *present life*. In proof of this it will be sufficient to adduce the following texts: *We speak wisdom among them that are PERFECT.* 1 Cor. ii. 6. *Let us, as many as be PERFECT, be thus minded.* Philip. iii. 15. *And he gave some, Apostles;—for the PERFECTING of the saints,—till we all come, in the unity*
of

of the faith and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a PERFECT man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine. Eph. iv. 13, 14. Ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk, is unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of FULL AGE, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto PERFECTION. Heb. v. 12, 13, 14; and vi. 1.

The coming of that which is *perfect* then means, the arrival of full age, or of years of maturity. And Paul tells the *Corinthians*, that *tongues*, and *propheying*, and *knowledge*, shall cease in their church, when their church shall cease to be a *child*, and shall grow up to be a man, or come to a perfect age. By *knowledge* he means, not the just perception of things as they are, but some mystical interpretation of Scripture, or some false and
vain

vain ideas of some objects or other, which would *vanish away* with years. By *prophecies* he means, not predictions of future events, but some kind of hymns to the praise of God, and the order of *prophets*, which there was in the *Corinthian* church, denotes, not a peculiar set of men to foretell what is to come, but only a set of men who could deliver these hymns in a place of worship. And by *tongues* he means *tones*.

There cannot remain a doubt, I think, about the *place* and *period* to which he refers; it was not heaven and the resurrection, but the adult age of believers in the *Corinthian* church. And there remains not a doubt with me, that his *tongues* are not *languages*. *Whether there be tongues they shall cease*. He does not speak of those tongues which should *not be* conferred upon Christians, but of those which *had been* actually conferred. He does not speak of tongues which would *not be*, but of those which *were*. His words certainly *imply*, that no more *new* tongues were to be expected; but what they *affirm* is, that the *old* tongues would become *useless*. He does not say that GOD would WITHDRAW even *these*, but that they would *cease*; that
is,

is, that men would discontinue to speak in them. And the reason which he gives for it is, that these tongues were a *childish thing*. *Prophecies, tongues, and knowledge*, would last, he says, no longer than *that which is in part would last*; no longer than the childhood of the *Corinthian church*; when that was gone, and this church arrived at mature years, they would no longer *prophecy* or *speak in tongues*.

These *three* gifts, whatever they were, *Paul* considers as the attributes of *infancy*. And the cessation of *each* of them, he compares to the cessation of something similar in his *own person*, when he came past the age of childhood. *When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.*

1 Cor. xiii. 11. These *three* things which *Paul* did when he was a child, allude to those *three* gifts exercised amongst the *Corinthians*. He compares their present state to his former childhood, their prophecies to his understanding when a child; their tongues to his speech when a child; and their knowledge to his thoughts when a child. But, says he, "*When I became a man, I put away my childish things;*" and you assuredly will put away

L

" yours

"yours when you are grown a little older."

Can *tongues* then mean *languages*? Are languages one of the properties of *childhood*?

Oh were they one of those *childish things* which Paul put away when he became a man?

Do men when they come to years of maturity cease to speak *languages*, or is not speaking languages one of the characteristics of age?

Besides, according to you, the apostle mistook his comparison; for according to you, the *Corinthian* church was then in its *perfection*, contrary to his idea, that it was in its *childhood*; for its speaking in *languages* was not in any sense a weakness or an imperfection, but a mark of perfection and strength.

You may say, that miraculous languages were necessary in the infancy of the church; and that the extraordinary *care* of the parent is an indication of the great *weakness* of the child. But this is not the apostle's idea. He considers these tongues as belonging to the *child*, and not to the *parent*; not as an extraordinary instance of *care over* infancy, but as an essential property of *infancy* itself.

And he foresaw, that in the nature of things they must soon cease. The Christians who first spoke in tones, spoke from nature and

and necessity; but these tones, which were pure nature at first, became habits in time, and after *that* an intolerable affectation. As the objects which had produced these fervent passions and enthusiastic accents must gradually lose the power which they had over the mind by their novelty, so those passions must gradually subside, and those accents be heard no more. It would often happen, no doubt, that persons would continue to speak in tones after they had ceased to feel those strong emotions which at first gave rise to them; and that a succeeding generation would speak in the manner of its parents, which had never experienced that enthusiasm which its parents experienced, till at last those very tones, which struck people with reverence and awe at first, would become an object of contempt and ridicule. This was the case in the *Corinthian* church. The *Corinthians* at first spoke in tones from *feeling*, and the *impulses* of nature; but at the time when *Paul* wrote his epistle to them, they spoke from *choice* and *design*; nay, they spoke from *premeditation*. *When ye come together*, (says he, 1 Cor. xiv. 26.) *every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue,*

bath a revelation, bath an interpretation. It seems that a man spoke *his tongue*, as the others exercised the other gifts, in consequence of some preparation, and that he did not *always* speak in the *same* tongue.—The apostle saw these tones abused and sinking rapidly into contempt, and he foresaw that they would not be of long continuance in the church.

§. XLI. Religious people, however, have spoken in *tones* since the days of the apostles,—amongst whom the most distinguished are the *Quakers*. O sect, favoured of God! your tones and agitations discovered a portion of that same spirit which God poured out once on his beloved apostles; and your very *name* carries in it your apology, and justification. Acquainted only with the different relations which the phænomena of this world bear to one another, and a stranger to the strong powers of the world to come, the cold sceptic may perceive but little analogy between the spirit of philosophy, and the spirit of enthusiasm; or between the severe dictates of reason, and the undefined feelings of *Quakerism*. But the power of reason, and
the

the wisdom of philosophy, are but a weak barrier against the impressions of religion; and the sceptic himself often feels, in the hour of seriousness, those impulses which at another time, he would be the first to condemn.

The *Quakers*, to do them justice, have not disgraced the principle upon which they professed to act. Having placed themselves under the conduct of a superior and enlightened instinct, which they call the Spirit of God, they have in general been faithful to their leader, and consistent with themselves. With an attachment which reflects equal credit on them and on their principles, they have followed the leadings of the spirit, uncorrupted by the religion of the senses, or of the imagination; and they have formed their character, their piety, and their morals, upon the sober dictates of Christ within. Firm, though modest, unassuming but undaunted, they have borne their cheerful testimony to the cause of God and of his truth. Their worship is simple and solemn; and, like the object of it, spiritual and sublime. There the soul approaches to its God in meditation and silence, breathes out its wants and wishes before Him in the aspirations

which cannot be uttered, and departs from his presence, refreshed by his blessing. Avoiding all religious disputes, they have not even attempted to define that *inward light* which guides their steps; they have only explained a few of its properties; and though their language has been sometimes mystical, their meaning has been always obvious. The *Quakers* have been always distinguished for their good sense, prudence, sobriety, and sincerity; qualities which are useful indeed to themselves, but which they render useful also to their fellow-creatures. Witness their charity and friendship to their poor, their generous efforts to save the friendless negroes from the scourge of bondage, the peace and quietness in which they live with their neighbours, and the example which they exhibit of a veneration for God, in refusing to make oaths, and of a tenderness for the life of man, in their abhorrence of war. Detesting slavery in every form, and animated by the love of liberty civil and religious, they have neither flattered tyrants, nor opposed the toleration of their fellow Christians.

Nothing is necessary to make men speak in tones, but the elevation of their passions to

a certain degree; the passions of thousands of people, under much greater disadvantages than the apostles, have actually been raised to this degree, and it was not possible but that those of the apostles should be raised to it, and impel them, not only to express a transient sound in a momentary tone, but to speak in continued tones, and tones of the most fervent kind. I am far, however, from thinking, that mere exertions of the will can elevate the passions to this degree, or that the most intense contemplations can ever of themselves determine men to speak in tones. The concurrence of some other cause, no doubt, is necessary.

It would be a curious speculation to investigate the causes which have produced, at different times, those paroxysms of religious fervour, of which we read in the history of the church; and it would connect, not improperly, with the subject of this essay: but this essay is too long already; and I must be here content with observing, that those paroxysms are to be ascribed rather to physical than to moral causes. There are countries whose inhabitants are not susceptible of the fervours of religion; and there are, even in the same

same country, certain periods in which people have not the same disposition to them, as they have at another period, though the moral causes be the same. How often has it happened, that people of one age have arrived, instantly as it were, at that high pitch of devotion, to which their ancestors had in vain aspired for a long succession of ages! And what is yet most remarkable, this religious fervour cools and subsides at the very time when moral causes are using their utmost efforts to support it in that point of elevation, to which it had spontaneously risen;—a sufficient proof alone, that moral causes did but concur with some other cause, stronger than themselves, to raise this fervour to that elevation at first.

LASTLY;—I propose to leave the real and efficient cause of speaking in tongues in the same obscurity in which it is left by the writers of the New Testament; and the obscurity in which they leave it is an argument, that the effect was not speaking languages. Here there arise two questions; *First*, whether or no those writers considered this gift as a miracle; and *Secondly*, whether or no it was a miracle in reality.

First;

First; It may be asked, did the apostles consider this gift as a miracle? This question has not the least dependance upon the proper definition of miracles. Define them as you will, or if you cannot define them at all, you must allow that the apostles affixed some idea to the term; and the only question here is, Whether or no they classed speaking in tongues amongst those phænomena which they called miracles? They who defend the affirmative argue from the expression in which it is called, the gift of God, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. But it does not necessarily follow from these phrases, that those who used them, used them as equivalent in sense to what they, in other places, call a miracle. The word which is translated *gift*, is not appropriated to miraculous gifts; in its proper signification, and in the use of it by all writers, it denotes no more than a gift in general, without any reference to the quality of that gift, whether it was natural or supernatural, ordinary or extraordinary.

On the other hand, the person who will defend the negative, will argue from various topics. He will argue from the infinite numbers who were endowed with this gift,
and

and say, that the apostles could not consider that as a miracle which was so exceeding common, because they always speak of miracles as something extraordinary. He will argue from the directions which they give how to exercise it, and say that it could never have entered their thoughts to presume to direct when or how the power of working miracles was to be exerted, because they knew *that* not to be under the controul of man. He will argue from the abuse of this gift, and affirm, that the power of working what they call miracles, was in no other instance abused, and that if they regarded this as a miracle, they would not have given any caution against the abuse of it, any more than they have against abusing the power of raising a dead man to life. He will argue from the manner of its communication; for we read that it was communicated twice by the apostles; once by *Paul* to some *Ephesians*, by prayer and the imposition of hands; and once by *Peter* and *John* to the *Samaritans*, by the imposition of hands alone; and conclude, that the apostles could not call *that* a miracle, which it was in their power to confer upon others; as we never read that the power of raising

sing the dead was thus transmitted from one man to another. He will argue from the total silence of the apostles, in never affirming that this gift was a miracle, and say, that, as they never do call it a miracle so they did not believe that it was a miracle, because no reason can be given why, if they believed otherwise, they should not call it by its proper name. And he will argue, lastly from the distinction which *Paul* more than once or twice makes between miracles and speaking in tongues. *Are all prophets? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healings? Do all speak with tongues?* 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. It may indeed be objected, that *Paul* does not here class *prophecy* and the *gifts of healings* among the miracles, which yet, it will be said, he must have known were real miracles. But the objection has no weight, because *prophecy* may not mean the prediction of future events, and *the gifts of healings* may as well mean natural as supernatural gifts. It is uncertain then, whether or no the apostles considered this gift as belonging to those which they have called *miracles*.

If it meant boldness of speech, or speaking in tones, there was no necessity to define
its

its nature; for the benefit which believers derived from it, as an earnest of a zeal and power already communicated to their heart, was precisely the same, whatever might be the immediate causes of the gift. But if it meant languages, the case was very different; for in this case, the principal value of them depended on the manner of their communication at first. As an evidence of the truth of Christianity, they had no force, but as they were miracles; for a believer's speaking two or three languages could be a sign of nothing but that there were two or three languages which he could speak, unless it was evident at the same time that he spoke them by inspiration and without having learnt them. And yet it is fact, that the gift of speaking in tongues is, throughout all the New Testament, simply called only the gift of God, without any clear reference to its derivation from a miraculous cause.

But that the scripture does not expressly call it a miracle, is no proof that it was not a miracle; was it then, or not, a miracle in reality? This is a question which every man must answer for himself, and to which no man can return an answer for another; for
it

it is a question about mere words, and the answer to it depends entirely upon the definition of a miracle. If a miracle be defined to be "an effect produced by the power of "God," every phænomenon in nature is a miracle; for what is nature and its laws but the energy of God? If it be defined "a "transgression of the laws of nature," there can be no miracle in the universe; for the power, principle, or law, by which the most extraordinary effects are wrought, is as much a part of nature, or of the laws which God has established, as the most common events. If a miracle be defined, "an effect "produced by the immediate operation of "God, and without the use of means," it is impossible for any man to tell whether speaking in tongues was a miracle or not; for the manner in which the first cause operates is unknown to mortal man, and the first principles of things are involved in impenetrable darkness. If, lastly, a miracle be defined, "an effect of whose cause we are "ignorant," this gift will be a miracle to those who cannot account for it, and to those who can, no miracle at all.

The

The *Jews* ascribed to an unknown cause, which they called the Holy Ghost, certain effects, not very dissimilar to those which the heathens ascribed to inspiration, or a divine *afflatus*. They both indeed represented the cause under the same idea, and by the same name. *Pacuvium putatis in scribendo leni animo ac remisso fuisse? fieri nullo modo potuit; sæpe enim audi vi poetam bonum neminem, sine inflammatione animorum existere posse, & sine quodam afflatu quasi furoris.* Cicero, de Oratore. Do you think that Pacuvius wrote in cold blood? It was impossible. His soul was on fire; and he was inspired by the breath of fury. That happy arrangement of the organs of the brain, that proper fermentation of the blood, that fire and enthusiasm in which consisted the poetic fury, the heathens ascribed to inspiration; that is, they called *inspiration* the unknown cause of these effects.

In like manner, that inflammation of soul, that intense devotion and benevolence, that burning zeal for God and his glory, and those bold and forcible expressions of it which characterised the first Christians, are attributed in the New Testament to an *inspiring* cause, erroneously called, in our translation,

lation, *Ghost* and *Spirit*. A *ghost* is a person, and what is still worse, that person is an *apparition*; and *spirit*, where it does not suggest the idea of "*person*," always suggests the idea of "*power*." But the original word means neither the one nor the other; and instead of "*Holy Ghost*" should have been universally rendered, "*Holy Breath*," as appears irrefragably from the following passage in John xx. 22. *And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost*; that is, most undoubtedly, the "*holy breath*;" for what but a *breath* did our Lord breathe on his disciples? or what besides *breath* is capable of being breathed? Animation, power, or a new life and new energies, were certainly the effect, but the cause was a *holy breath*, or a divine inspiration. But to give to the unknown cause a name, is not to give a definition of it; and as different persons will define it differently, so they will, of course, think differently about its miraculous nature.

The idea adopted in this essay, of speaking in tongues, if just, is attended with consequences of some importance. It secures the gift from all those numerous objections which

which may be urged against it, as the gift of languages. It saves Theologists the trouble of attempting to prove, that the idioms and phrases of the New Testament run in the stile of *classic elegance*, or that a language, incorrect, confused, and barbarous, may yet be the language of the Holy Ghost. It affords a new and additional evidence in confirmation of the truth of Christianity;—an evidence founded on the very constitution of the human mind. It opens a new field for moral disquisitions of different kinds, and it shews that no missionary on earth, however pious or benevolent, has a right to expect a miraculous gift of languages, to facilitate his labour in the conversion of heathens. Having to add only in the words of the poet,

—Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum;

I remain as usual,

dear Friend,

sincerely your's,

